

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING
Pursuant to Iowa Code §21.4
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
IOWACCESS ADVISORY COUNCIL
Wednesday, July 9, 2008, 10:00 AM – 1:00 PM
Grimes Building, 2nd Floor, Board Room

1. Introductions
Richard Neri, Chair
 2. Discussion of Quantitative Scoring Mechanism
Richard Neri, Chair
 3. Wrap Up And Adjourn
Richard Neri, Chair
-

Financial Cost/Benefit Criteria
<i>Uses a 1 to 5/10/15 (varies according to factor being rated) scale:</i>
Current Iowa ROI Criteria
<i>Statutory requirement (15 points total): Project is required by law or regulation, or it is needed to comply with state IT standards. No points unless the project fulfills a mandate. 15 for required by law? 10 if required by IT standards or necessary to interface with existing application? 5 if to meet agency mission (if so, then why not funded by agency</i>
<i>Improves customer service (15 points): The bigger the improvement, the more points. Faster response time? Easier to use? More secure?</i>
<i>Impacts citizens (10 points): More points for greater impact. Number of citizens? Demographics of citizens (Veterans, Children, Low Income, etc.)?</i>
<i>Reengineers government processes (10 points): The most points for "significant" use of IT to revamp business processes. 10 for total replacement? 5 if adds new dimension to existing service?</i>
<i>Project participants (10 points): The most points for projects needed by every state agency.</i>
<i>Risk (10 points): More points for projects with low technical and business risk and high chance of success.</i>
<i>Experience and past performance (5 points): More points to agencies that are historically better at achieving project objectives.</i>
<i>Funding requirements (10 points): More points to projects at advanced stages of implementation. 10 for project well along; 5 for project with design work completed?</i>
<i>Additional funding sources (5 points): More points to projects for which agencies will share costs with the IT department. 10 for matched by agency funds? 5 for partially supported by agency funds? Distinguish funding from other resource commitments (e.g., people or server space)</i>
Public Return on Investment Criteria
<i>Uses a 1 to 10 scale:</i>
<i>Social — impacts on family or community relationships, social mobility, status, and identity.</i>
<i>Stewardship — impacts on the public's view of government officials as faithful stewards or guardians of the value of the government itself in terms of public trust, integrity, and</i>
Capability Maturity Criteria
<i>Uses a 1 to 5 scale to assess how capable, or "mature", an entity has been in developing past projects:</i>
<i>Initial (chaotic, ad hoc, heroic) - the starting point for use of a new process. Processes are usually ad hoc and the organization usually does not provide a stable environment.</i>
<i>Repeatable (project management, process discipline) - the process is used repeatedly. Some project management may be used, with project status and deliverables being visible to management at various times. Costs, schedules and functionality are tracked over time.</i>
<i>Defined (institutionalized) - the process is defined/confirmed as a standard business process. The organization's management establishes process objectives based on the organization's set of standard processes and ensures that these objectives are</i>

Managed (quantified) - process management and measurement takes place. Using precise measurements, management can effectively control the software development effort.

Optimized (process improvement) - process management includes deliberate process optimization/improvement. Maturity level 5 focuses on continually improving process performance through both incremental and innovative technological improvements.

Versatility Criteria

Uses a 1 to 10 scale:

Reuse supports common requirements by referring to existing designs and implementations of services and components.

IOWA Access Share Criteria

Uses a 1 to 10 scale:

Ratio of agency project to all projects. This would rank the proposed project relative to other proposals on the following dimensions:

Proportion of agency funding \$ to other agencies \$

Proportion of project count to other agencies count

Proportion of # projects per year

Number of active projects by agency vs. all active projects



June 16, 2008

Richard Neri, Chairman
IOWAccess Advisory Council
24215 195th Street
Bettendorf, IA 52722

Dear Mr. Chairman;

After reviewing the project funding recommendations from the May 7, 2008 meeting, I have reluctantly decided to not accept those recommendations. I am asking that the council reconsider the prioritization of the projects at the council's earliest convenience.

Concerns have been raised in several areas about the equitable distribution of funding for a number of funds managed by DAS. In response to those concerns I requested a review of IOWAccess funding, broken out by recipient agency. I was surprised to learn that over the last 3 fiscal years one agency has received more than 25% of the total funds awarded. By comparison, the second ranking recipient accounted for just over 8% of the funds awarded.

A great number of deserving projects have been funded by the council during its tenure. However, we all realize that the resources of the IOWAccess fund are finite. Every project can not be funded and in saying yes to one project we are now forced to say no to others. As responsible stewards, we must look at how best to allocate these resources so that all agencies can benefit.

As you evaluate projects brought to you, I would ask that consideration be given to the level of IOWAccess funding that the requesting agency has previously received. Further, I would request that you work with the IOWAccess Coordinator, Malcolm Huston, to develop and implement a standard scoring mechanism that will allow a more quantitative ranking of project proposals and better capture the project's impact on the public.

Thank you for your continued service on the council and your understanding and cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

Mollie Anderson
Director

c: John Gillispie
Mark Uhrin

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING
Pursuant to Iowa Code §21.4
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
IOWACCESS ADVISORY COUNCIL
Wednesday, July 9, 2008, 1:00 PM – 4:30 PM
Grimes Building, 2nd Floor, Board Room

- 1.Introductions, Approve Minutes
Richard Neri, Chair
 - 2.Council Ethics Refresher
Charlie Smithson, Ethics & Campaign Disclosure Board
 - 3.Iowa Interactive Update
Tracy Smith, Iowa Interactive
 - 4.IOWAccess Projects and Projections Spreadsheets/Monthly Report
Malcolm Huston, IOWAccess Manager
- OLD BUSINESS:**
- 5.OpenUp.Iowa – Request for Design Funding Increase **\$42,000**
Mark Uhrin, DAS-ITE
 - 6.State of Iowa Online Stores– Request for Hosting Fees **\$2,000**
Mark Uhrin, DAS-ITE
 - 7.Interactive Forms - Request for Scope Analysis Funding **\$20,000**
Drew Dinsmore, DAS-ITE
 - 8.Business License Information Center (BLIC) project – Request for Execution Funding **Revised Amount: \$292,040**
Sherri Timmins, Department of Economic Development **(Previously \$367,880)**
 - 9.Hazardous Substance Incident Database – Request for Execution Funding **\$280,000**
Adam Broughton, Department of Natural Resources
- NEW BUSINESS:**
10. DOM Local Gov Budgets & Reports – Request for Execution Funding **\$216,000**
Jim Nervig, Department of Management
 11. State Library Live Helper Pro Plus Package – Request for Execution Funding **\$405**
Malcolm Huston, IOWAccess Manager
 12. Iowa Child Advocacy Board - ICAB Online – Request for Execution Funds & First Year Hosting **\$245,000+\$3,500**
Richard Moore, Iowa Child Advocacy Board
 13. DNR Special Events Coordination - Request for Scope Analysis Funding **\$20,000**
Jeff Kopaska, Department of Natural Resources
 14. Counties Real Estate Web portal - Request for Increase in Execution Funds **\$69,120**
Ken Kline, County Real Estate Electronic Government Advisory Committee
 15. Discussion: Dormancy Policy and Letting State Government Know That There Is A Shortage Of Funds
Malcolm Huston, IOWAccess Manager
 16. ITE Project Updates
Mark Uhrin, DAS-ITE
 17. Wrap Up And Adjourn
Richard Neri, Chair
-

**IOWAccess Advisory Council
Meeting Minutes of May 7, 2008, 1:00 PM
Hoover Building, Level A, Conference Room 7**

Draft

- Present: Richard Neri, Barbara Corson, Kathleen Richardson, Beth Baldwin, Terrence Neuzil*, Lawrence Lentz*, Terri Selberg, Dawn Ainger* (at 1:30)
- Absent: Tom Gronstal, Kelly Hayworth, Andrew Smith, Glen Dickinson, Ron Wieck, Jeff Danielson, Vicki Lensing, Sheila Castaneda, Dan McGinn
- Guests: John Gillispie, Diane Van Zante, Malcolm Huston, Mark Uhrin, Kent Hartwig, Kristine Cavell, Sherry Timmins, Adam Broughton, JoAnn Naples, Drew Dinsmore, Tracy Smith, Wayne Middleton

* By phone

Council Chair, Dick Neri, opened the meeting at 1:29 p.m. and noted that a quorum of members was present.

1. Introductions, New Member, Approve Minutes, Election of Officers – Dick Neri, Chair.
The Council has a new member, Kathleen Richardson, who is the Director of Journalism at Drake University and the Executive Secretary of the Iowa Freedom of Information Council. Kathleen fills the media position vacated by Herb Strentz. All council members and guests introduced themselves.

A correction was offered to the March minutes. The term “transcaer” needs to be in all caps (TRANSCAER). Barb Corson moved approval of the amended March 12, 2008 meeting minutes; Beth Baldwin seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken, unanimously approving the minutes, as corrected.

Election of Officers (Chair and Vice Chair) – Dick Neri has graciously offered to serve another year as Chair. Beth Baldwin moved that Dick continue as Chair; Barb Corson seconded the motion. An oral vote was conducted; Mr. Neri was unanimously re-elected.

Barb Corson has graciously offered to serve another year as Vice Chair. Terrance Neuzil moved that Barb continue as Vice Chair; Beth Baldwin seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken; Ms. Corson was unanimously re-elected.

John Gillispie highlighted some recent developments. At present, unobligated cash in the IOWAccess fund stands at about \$200,000; total requests being considered at this meeting amount to more than that, so the Council must begin a prioritization process. Changes to DOT regulations with respect to drivers’ record fees will affect the revenue stream to IOWAccess, probably to the positive. Previously, there was no authority for county and local entities to seek and receive IOWAccess funds. The legislature did approve that, with the caveat that those entities give proprietary rights to the State. The bill setting aside the

million dollar appropriation to IOWAccess did pass, but has not yet been signed by the Governor. Pending the Governor's signature, these provisions would take effect July 1st.

2. Iowa Interactive Update – Tracy Smith, Iowa Interactive (handout).
The Department of Natural Resources cabins and campgrounds application continues to be well accepted; during March, there was an 11% increase in volume over the previous year. The Department of Transportation is seeing a downward trend in the number of records being purchased. This is due to a variety of factors, however it is hoped that new legislation will offset this trend. Iowa Workforce Development unemployment filings have doubled. Professional Licensure experienced a big renewal cycle in March; online renewal jumped from 753 occurrences to 3499.
3. IOWAccess Financial Update – Malcolm Huston.
Financial statements were presented for the IOWAccess fund for the period ending March 31, 2008. Unobligated cash at the end of March stood at \$203,965.
4. IOWAccess Projects and Projections Spreadsheet/Monthly Report – Malcolm Huston.
Non-ITE project updates have been added to the spreadsheet. For projects already in phase one or two, we have anticipated future funding requests. If the Council approves all of the projects on today's agenda as well as the next phase of existing projects, the IOWAccess fund could be in the red. The Council could choose to delay projects, reduce the amount approved, or to disallow today's projects or the ones coming up. There are many variables. Current projections do take into account the new appropriation, but do not contain added revenue which might result from the new legislation (which may not be a significant amount).

Discussion:

- Can the Council approve projects, pending future funding, so that they are in the queue? Money could be committed, but there would be no account for the agency to draw from. Finance staff would have to consider whether this is a feasible approach.
- Projected next phases for existing projects are simply estimates for some future point in time. The projects in front of the Council today are ready to proceed.
- It is unlikely that the Council would be allowed to commit more than is available. Until now, the Council has not needed to prioritize projects.
- Nothing on the agenda is a brand new project; each is in one of the succeeding phases.
- There are projects with unspent committed funds that go back to FY04, 05, and 06. Most of those dollars probably need to be swept back. Do we ask the entity or do we simply set a policy that unspent funds will be reallocated? If we do pull back funds, we need to be sure that any complaints are resolved prior to doing so.

Malcolm will revisit each project, try to determine the status, and report back at the next meeting; he will also format a motion on dormancy for the next meeting. At a future time, the Council may wish to recommend that money be rescinded when there is a lengthy period of inactivity.

5. OpenUp.Iowa – Request for Design Funding Increase (\$42,000) – Mark Uhrin.

OpenUp Iowa is a board and commission website and database that increases openness in state government and educates Iowans about boards and commissions. It will simplify the board and commission application process and improve the appointment process. The increase in funding is being sought due to a clerical error in the original request and the inclusion of a formal business analysis function (this is the first project to undergo formal business analysis) which is estimated to take 350 staff hours. Question: Does that mean that ITE is charging \$120/hour? Yes; ITE rates will be discussed later in the meeting in association with agenda item #10. Dawn Ainger moved that the item be tabled until the July meeting to give the Council an opportunity to reassess the funding situation and to learn more about the new pricing structure. The motion was subsequently withdrawn, pending discussion of agenda item #10.

Did we decide we could approve projects, pending availability of future funding? Yes, the Council decided to explore that option. How do we resolve who gets “tentatively approved funding” first? Will the price increase likely affect all projects? It will probably affect any follow on phases for existing projects.

At this point, council members agreed to divert from the order of the posted agenda and move to item #10:

10. ITE Project Updates/Pricing – Mark Uhrin.

Over the past several months, ITE has been through an exhaustive process to identify accurate costs and rates. Staff rates have held steady at \$89.50 per hour for the last four years. Salaries have gone up an average of 7% per year, but that has not been reflected in the rates. The rate that would cover expenses, given a 60% productivity rate (factors out all non billable time such as vacation, sick time, administrative time, and training) is about \$117/hour. That is the cost of the employee, office space, access to phone, computer, share of overhead, benefits package, etc. It is the fully loaded cost to deliver a service; there is no profit, this is a break-even rate. The rate is tentative at the moment and has not been approved.

Discussion:

- This rate appears to be much higher than the overall marketplace. Agencies may ask what added value they receive by using ITE when they can get a contractor with a computer and office space for \$85/hour.
- Agencies look at the invoice cost; that is not the total cost of hiring a contractor.
- The Council is not in a position to address ITE’s prices/the cost of labor.

Council members returned to discussion of agenda item #5.

It has been suggested that the Council approve the request, pending available funding. If multiple projects are approved, how will the Council determine which one receives funding first?

Barb Corson moved approval of the request, pending available funding; Beth Baldwin seconded the motion. Discussion: How many people will be working on the project? Three.

An oral vote was taken and recorded as follows:

Opposed: Dawn Ainger

Abstain: None

In Favor: All others

The motion passed.

At the July meeting, the Council needs to define procedures for the approval of funding based on availability (address the question “who’s first, who’s second?” etc.). Malcolm suggested that projects approved today be prioritized at the conclusion of the meeting. The Council agreed.

6. State of Iowa Online Stores – Request for Hosting Fees (\$2000) – Mark Uhrin.
Iowa Interactive is developing a common online state storefront where agencies can post items for sale. The Council is being asked to fund the first year’s hosting. During that time, we will be able to gauge the overall interest. After the initial year, the agency takes over its share of the hosting fees. Will there be a transaction fee on the purchase? Yes, part of the fee will go to Iowa Interactive and part will go to ITE to cover hosting costs after the first year. At present, we have no way to predict the volume of sales, so it is difficult to set a fee. Dawn Ainger moved approval; Barb Corson seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken; the motion passed unanimously. Approval of this request is immediate, not pending the availability of funds.
7. Interactive Forms – Request for Scope Analysis Funding (\$20,000) – Kent Hartwig, Department of Veterans Affairs.
The Iowa Veterans’ Affairs website is one of the best in the nation; it is a one stop site for veterans. The first phase of the project included a total redesign of the website, expanded information, links to county services, a new page for families seeking help, and vital information for mental health, counseling, and treatment. The website should go live in a couple of weeks. The next step is to make all forms interactive so that veterans can fill them out online. This would streamline the entire process. Terri Selberg moved approval of funding, pending availability; Larry Lentz seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken; the motion passed unanimously.
8. Business License Information Center (BLIC) project – Request for Execution Funding (\$367,880) – Sherry Timmins and Kristine Cavell, Department of Economic Development (IDED).
By statute, IDED has a mandate to provide for job creation. They are also required to provide a clearinghouse for all regulatory requirements for business and commercial activities. That includes: how to apply, applicable approvals and exemptions, fees, and changes and updates to regulations. BLIC improves service to existing and prospective businesses, decreases unnecessary delays, improves compliance rates, enables more focus on core business and provides information on demand. Kristine demoed the features of the new website.

Discussion:

- Is it correct that no fees are taken in, it is strictly an informational site? Yes.

- The price per webpage seems quite high. Does ITE have the cost detail? No. Mark Uhrin believes there is a detailed workplan and the cost estimate would be based on that.
- Suggestion to table the request until such time that costs can be substantiated.

Dawn Ainger made a motion to table the request until July; Barb Corson seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken; the request was unanimously tabled.

9. Hazardous Substance Incident Database – Request for Execution Funding (\$280,000) – Adam Broughton, Department of Natural Resources (DNR).

This project involves a redesign of the current database and combines all of the historical databases into one new database. The new database will be more usable and searchable. Previously, the Council approved a total of \$55,000 for the planning and design phases. The implementation phase will develop and code the web front end, develop and code the database, migrate information from the existing and historical databases, and provide for application testing, debugging, and deployment. Training and outreach costs will be paid in-house. Due to numerous delays, DNR wants to develop an RFP and have the implementation completed by a private contractor. Since the initial estimates were provided by ITE, would it be advantageous to wait until the RFP comes back with a more precise cost? Prior to release, the RFP must also go to the Technology Governance Board (TGB) for approval. JoAnn Naples explained that DNR wants to get the database completed and rolled out as soon as possible. There is a timing issue related to getting approvals from the Environmental Protection Committee and the TGB; it would be helpful to know now that funding has been approved. Beth Baldwin moved approval of the request as presented, assuming a 90 day delay (to go through the RFP process); Barb Corson seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken and recorded as follows:

Opposed: None

Abstain: Dawn Ainger

In Favor: All others

The motion passed.

11. Wrap Up and Adjourn –

If the BLIC project and succeeding phases of existing projects are removed from the Projects and Projections Spreadsheet, Malcolm believes there is sufficient funding for all projects approved at today's meeting. If that should not be the case, it might be wise to prioritize them. Beth Baldwin moved that the projects be prioritized as follows:

1st – Interactive Forms (Veterans Affairs)

2nd – Hazardous Incident Database (DNR)

3rd – OpenUp Iowa (IGOV)

Dawn Ainger seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken; the motion passed unanimously.

The next meeting is July 9. As a result of today's meeting, there will be a lot of work to do, including how to prioritize items in the future. The ROI (return on investment) form contains a scoring mechanism that could be used if desired. Council members should keep in mind not only what is up for approval at a particular meeting, but also what is right around the corner.

Is it appropriate to stop accepting new projects for the time being? Probably not, however Malcolm is asked to counsel agencies on funding issues.

In light of approval of legislation to pursue county and local business, what can the Council do to let state government know that there is a shortage of funds? Malcolm was asked to add this item to the agenda for the July meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:02.

DICKSTEINSHAPIRO_{LLP}

1825 Eye Street NW | Washington, DC 20006-5403
TEL (202) 420-2200 | FAX (202) 420-2201 | dicksteinshapiro.com

June 3, 2008

Personal

Via E-Mail

Chairman Richard Neri
24215 195th Street
Bettendorf, IA 52722
dick.n@msn.com

Dear Chairman Neri:

I have thoroughly enjoyed representing the Citizens of the State of Iowa as a member of the IOWAccess Advisory Council during the past year. I am very proud of the projects we were able to help support through the IOWAccess funding approval decision process. Unfortunately, I wanted to inform the Council that I must resign as a member of the Council immediately as I have recently accepted employment with the law firm of Dickstein Shapiro LLP in Washington D.C. I am sorry if this causes any inconvenience to the Council and its ability to carry out its mission.

Sincerely,

Andrew E. Smith
smitha@dicksteinshapiro.com

AES/aes

cc: Malcolm Huston
IOWAccess Manager
State of Iowa
Department of Administrative Services
malcolm.huston@iowa.gov

**IGOV Boards & Commissions Web Application
(OpenUpIowa.gov)
Change to Design Funding.**

Request: \$42,000 of additional funding for Design phase.

This is a request to change the approved amount of funding for the Design Phase of this project to \$62,000. There are several reasons for the change in funding level:

- The original estimate inadvertently omitted approximately 105 hours of identified tasks in Detailed Use Case development.
- We have added a formal business analyst function that will reduce implementation risk and cost. That cost was not anticipated in the original estimate.
- The number and complexity of migration activities from current IGOV databases/spreadsheets to the new application and the number of financial interfaces was not fully understood at the time the original estimate was made.
- Screen mockups are taking more time than originally anticipated.

Original Design Funding Request		Additional Hours	Revised Total	Notes
Activity	HRS	HRS	HRS	
Complete Detail Use Cases (~ 45 use cases)	30	190	220	The original request total omitted over 100 hours that were estimated. Added BA tasks to reduce implementation cost and risk.
Complete Screen Mockups (~30 screens remaining)	82	80	162	Mockups taking 2-4 hours rather than the 1.5 estimated.
Design & Requirements	88	40	128	Additional hours are to cover the additional use case detail.
Migration & Interfaces	0	40	40	Added interfaces to Payroll and Transportation financial systems not included in the original estimate.
Hours Total	200	350	550	
Cost Totals	\$20,000.	\$42,000.	\$62,000.	

ONLINE STORE HOSTING FOR ONE YEAR

The Legislative Services Agency will shortly be offering various items for sale online that are currently only available on an over-the-counter basis, using an application developed by Iowa Interactive. After that agency's store is operational, plans are to make the same application serve the DAD Print Shop and then explore other sales or service possibilities. To facilitate adoption, ITE is recommending that one year of hosting be provided to agencies to conduct online sales of State of Iowa products and services. The hosting would be a shared service, so one agency can simply join an existing agency on the same hosting environment. After the initial year, the agency takes over their cost of hosting fees.

Hosting fees for one year plus setup, plus code installs would be \$2,000. The one-year period would be extended until all agencies have completed their first year of service at which point the hosting fees would cease.



IOWAccess Project Concept Paper

1. Email completed copy to the IOWAccess Manager: malcolm.huston@iowa.gov .
2. Send signed hard copy to Malcolm Huston, IOWAccess Manager, DAS-ITE, Hoover B Level, Des Moines, IA, 50319-0150.
3. Contact ITE or vendor to prepare for project.

Date: 4/24/2008

Project Name: **IDVA Website Redesign Interactive Forms**

Is this project in support of a program designated as an Iowa Great Place, pursuant to section 303.3c?:

Requesting Agency:

Yes No

Project Point(s)-of-Contact: *(include name and phone number)*

Kent Hartwig
 Executive Officer
 Iowa Department of Veterans Affairs
 Camp Dodge, Bldg. A6A
 7105 - NW 70th Avenue
 Johnston, IA 50131-1824
 Office: 515-242-0031
 Fax: 515-242-5659

Project Sponsor: *(include name and phone number)*

Patrick Palmersheim
 Executive Director
 Iowa Department of Veterans Affairs
 Camp Dodge, Bldg. A6A
 7105 - NW 70th Avenue
 Johnston, IA 50131-1824
 Office: 515-242-5331
 Fax: 515-242-5659

Background:

Iowa Interactive has completely renovated the IDVA static website. This project is for ITE to add the capability for our veterans to be able to apply online to IDVA for

1. The Veterans Trust Fund
2. Veterans Commemorative Property transactions
3. County Grant Program
4. Vietnam Bonus Program
5. Military Home Ownership Program
6. All other application for benefits and service currently made to the IDVA

These forms should be interactive so that counties and veterans may fill them out online and submit them without printing and mailing.

A third project is planned after the completion of the CoMIS project (also being funded by IOWAccess) to provide a protected site for the counties to access forms and submit securely, along with other information deemed necessary by the department.

Expected Results in this Project:

This project would greatly improve the way veterans are able to apply to the IDVA for benefits and service by having an online application process.

Request: *(include dollar amount and description of what will be purchased - i.e. services, hardware, software)*

\$20,000 for ITE Services

Project Timeline:

<i>Phase</i>	<i>Start Month/Year</i>	<i>End Month/Year</i>	<i>Estimated Amount</i>
Scope Analysis	May/08	July/08	\$20,000.
Design	July/08	Sept/08	\$20,000
Implementation	July/08	Sept/08	Included above

Resources Being Contributed: *(people or funds being contributed to the project by the sponsoring agency-include role/% of time or amount in dollars)*

Kent Hartwig and Jill Joseph will contribute 5% of work time with the development team to establish a scope of work and to ensure the project will fit the department's needs. Additional funding from the department is not available.

Recipients of this Service:

Iowa Department of Veterans Affairs
 Iowa Veterans Commission
 Iowa County Commissions of Veterans Affairs
 Iowa National Guard
 Veterans of Iowa and their families

Acknowledgement of Conditions for

Approval of IOWAccess Project

Project Approval Conditions

IOWAccess Revolving Fund project approvals are based upon the application materials submitted to the IOWAccess Advisory Council and approved by the Director of DAS. Recipients of IOWAccess projects are subject to the following conditions.

- The Iowa Accountable Government Act, Iowa Code Chapter 8E
- Information technology standards and practices that are applicable to "participating agencies", the Office of the Governor, and elective constitutional or statutory officers pursuant to Iowa Code Section 8A.206.
- Iowa Administrative Code Section 11-25(8A) - Information Technology Operational Standards.
- Policies and procedures of the IOWAccess Advisory Council and DAS as outlined in this acknowledgement or published on their websites.

IOWAccess Project Policy Guides

The acceptance of an IOWAccess Project is based on the following:

- Sponsoring agency is responsible for the efficient and effective administration of IOWAccess Projects through the application of sound management practices.
- The IOWAccess Project Process is guidance only and describes a customary sequence used in software development. As such, sponsoring agencies are not required to conform to the IOWAccess Project Process.
- Sponsoring agency assumes responsibility for using IOWAccess funds in a manner consistent with program objectives and the terms and conditions of the IOWAccess Project.

- Sponsoring agency will commit appropriate resources in a timely manner to the project to prevent undue delay in project completion.
- Sponsoring agency will be responsible for compliance with audit requirements.
- Approval of one phase of an IOWAccess project does not mean that other phases will be approved. Each phase is subject to separate approval.

Guidelines for Costs

Allowable costs

To be allowable under IOWAccess Projects, costs must meet the following general criteria:

- Be necessary and reasonable for proper and efficient performance of IOWAccess Projects.
- Be authorized or not prohibited under State or local laws or regulations.
 - ✓ Not be included as a cost or used to meet cost sharing or matching requirements of any other State or Federal Project in either the current or a prior period, except as specifically provided by State law or regulation.

Reasonable costs

A cost is reasonable if, in its nature and amount, it does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the cost. In determining the reasonableness of a cost, consideration shall be given to:

- Whether the cost is of a type generally recognized as ordinary and necessary for the operation of the sponsoring agency or performance under the IOWAccess Project.
- Market prices for comparable goods or services.

Composition of Cost

Typical costs chargeable to IOWAccess Projects are:

- Cost of materials acquired, consumed, or expended specifically for the purpose of those Projects.
- Equipment and other capital expenditures detailed in the application and previously approved as part of the Project.

Amounts not recoverable as costs under one State or Federal Project may not be shifted to another State or Federal Project, unless specifically authorized by State or Federal legislation or regulation.

Availability of Funds

DAS Finance processes the disbursement of all funds for IOWAccess Projects. Qualifying expenditures for goods and services obtained from other than DAS-ITE or Iowa Interactive, LLC, must be paid by the sponsor and submitted to DAS for reimbursement. In order to facilitate the timely processing of IOWAccess Project reimbursements, entities must use the following process:

- The request must be submitted by the sponsor in writing or through e-mail to the IOWAccess Manager.
- The request must include the following information:
 - ✓ Identification of the IOWAccess Project for which reimbursement is being sought,
 - ✓ The amount of reimbursement requested,
 - ✓ Period of time covered by request,
 - ✓ A comprehensive description of the items covered by the request, and

- ✓ Copies of any supportive documentation (e.g. vendor invoices, documentation for completed work).
- The IOWAccess Manager will review the supporting financial information and evaluate it against the originally approved project.
- When satisfied that the request meets the stated requirements, the IOWAccess Manager will recommend the request for approval for payment and submit it to DAS Finance for processing.
- In no case will the total reimbursement for each phase exceed the approved amount of the Project phase.

The sponsor seeking reimbursement of expenses is responsible for retaining all necessary documentation pertaining to the relevance and results of the work performed and will provide such documentation upon request. DAS Finance will refer the Auditor of State to the sponsor should there be any questions about the expenditures associated with the Project.

Sponsor Monthly Status Reports

No later than the 21st day of each month the sponsoring agency shall submit a status report to the IOWAccess Manager if work is being performed by a developer *other than DAS-ITE or Iowa Interactive, LLC*. This status report should include:

- A short narrative of the accomplishments for the month.
- Descriptions of any changes in tasks, resources, or issues materially affecting the project plan and, if necessary, a schedule with new target dates provided.

Changes to an Project

All changes to the Project, or the proposal that resulted in the Project, must be reviewed by the IOWAccess Advisory Council. The Sponsor must be prepared to appear before the IOWAccess Advisory Council to answer questions and provide any clarifications necessary prior to any action by the Council regarding a change to the Project. Reasons for requesting a change to the amount of the Project include, but are not limited to:

- Changes in the scope or objectives of the Project.
- Changes in the amount of project funding.
- Carryover of approved funding for a period of more than one year from the date of approval of the original funding.

All changes to an Project recommended by the IOWAccess Advisory Council must be subsequently approved by the Director of DAS.

Project Disputes

Iowa Code 679A.19 DISPUTES BETWEEN GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES.

“Any litigation between administrative departments, commissions or boards of the state government is prohibited. All disputes between said governmental agencies shall be submitted to a board of arbitration of three members to be composed of two members to be appointed by the departments involved in the dispute and a third member to be appointed by the governor. The decision of the board shall be final.”

Sponsor Acceptance

Signing below will signify that sponsor acknowledges and agrees to the IOWAccess project approval conditions as defined in this document.

Sponsor Signature	IOWAccess Manager Signature
Date	Date



IOWAccess Advisory Council

IOWAccess Revolving Fund Project Application

Proposing agencies should complete and submit Parts I, II and III to request Design approval, then complete and submit Parts IV and V to request Implementation approval.

Part I - Project Information

Date:	June 23, 2008
Agency Name:	Iowa Department of Economic Development (IDED)
Project Name:	10236 – Business License Information Center (BLIC)
Agency Manager:	Sherry Timmins, Regulatory Assistance Coordinator
Agency Manager Phone Number / E-Mail:	Sherry Timmins, 515.242.4901, Sherry.Timmins@iowalifechanging.com
Executive Sponsor (Agency Director or Designee):	Michael Tramontina, Director
Initial Total for Design:	\$ 25,000
Initial Total for Implementation:	\$278,520 – implementation phase \$ 13,520 – 1 st year hosting \$292,040
Initial Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:	\$317,040
Project Timeline: (estimate start and end dates for project spending)	Design Start Date: November, 2007 Design End Date: May, 2007 Implementation Start Date: July, 2008 Implementation End Date: February, 2009
Revised Total for Design and Implementation:	\$317,040

Revised Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:

\$

Part II - Project Overview

A. Project Summary: Describe the nature and use of the proposed project, including what is to be accomplished, how it will be accomplished, and what the costs and benefits will be.

Response:

B. Strategic Plan: How does the proposed project fit into the strategic plan of the requesting agency?

Response:

C. Current Technology: Provide a summary of the technology used by the current system. How does the proposed project impact the agency's technological direction? Are programming elements consistent with a Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) approach? Are programming elements consistent with existing enterprise standards?

Response:

D. Statutory or Other Requirements

Is this project or expenditure necessary for compliance with a Federal law, rule, or order?

YES (If "Yes", cite the specific Federal law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is impacted by it.)

Response:

Is this project or expenditure required by state law, rule or order?

YES (If "YES", cite the specific state law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is impacted by it.)

Response:

Does this project or expenditure meet a health, safety or security requirement?

YES (If "YES", explain.)

Response:

Is this project or expenditure necessary for compliance with an enterprise technology standard?

YES (If "YES", cite the specific standard.)

Response:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]
Requirements/Compliance Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)



If the answer to these criteria is "no," the point value is zero (0). Depending upon how directly a qualifying project or expenditure may relate to a particular requirement (federal mandate, state mandate, health-safety-security issue, or compliance with an enterprise technology standard), or satisfies more than one requirement (e.g. it is mandated by state and federal law and fulfills a health and safety mandate), 1-15 points awarded.

E. Impact on Iowa's Citizens

1. Project Participants - List the project participants (i.e. single agency, multiple agencies, State government enterprise, citizens, associations, or businesses, other levels of government, etc.) and provide commentary concerning the nature of participant involvement. Be sure to specify who and how many **direct** users the system will impact. Also specify whether the system will be of use to other interested parties: who they may be, how many people are estimated, and how they will use the system.

Response:

2. Service Improvements - Summarize the extent to which the project or expenditure improves service to Iowa citizens or within State government. Included would be such items as improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, providing enhanced services, improving work processes, etc.

Response:

3. Citizen Impact – Summarize how the project leads to a more informed citizenry, facilitates accountability, and encourages participatory democracy. If this is an extension of another project, what has been the adoption rate of Iowa's citizens or government employees with the preceding project?

Response:

4. Public Health and/or Safety – Explain requirements or impact on the health and safety of the public.

Response:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Impact Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)

- Minimally directly impacts Iowa citizens (0-5 points).
- Moderately directly impacts Iowa citizens (6-10 points).
- Significantly directly impacts Iowa citizens (11-15 points).



[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]



Customer Service Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- Minimally improves customer service (0-3 points).
- Moderately improves customer service (4-6 points).
- Significantly improves customer service (7-10 points).

F. Scope

Is this project the first part of a future, larger project?

- YES (If "YES", explain.) NO, it is a stand-alone project

Response:

Is this project a continuation of a previously begun project?

- YES (If "YES", explain.)

Response:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Scope Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- This is the first year of a multi-year project / expenditure or project / expenditure duration is one year (0-5 points)
- The project / expenditure is of a multi-year nature and each annual component produces a definable and stand-alone outcome, result or product (2-8 points).
- This is beyond the first year of a multi-year project / expenditure (6-10 points)

The last part of this criteria involves rating the extent to which a project or expenditure is at an advanced stage of implementation and termination of the project / expenditure would waste previously invested resources.

G. Source of Funds

On a fiscal year basis, how much of the total project cost (\$ amount and %) would be absorbed by your agency from non-Pooled Technology/IOWAccess funds? If desired, provide additional comment / response below.

Response:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Funds Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)

- 0% (0 points)

- 1%-12% (1 point)
 - 13%-25% (2 points)
 - 25%-38% (3 points)
 - 39%-50% (4 points)
 - Over 50% (5 points)
-

Part III – Design Proposal

Amount of Design Funding Requested: \$

A. Process Reengineering

Provide a *pre-project or pre-expenditure* (before implementation) description of the impacted system or process. Be sure to include the procedures used to administer the impacted system or process and how citizens interact with the current system.

Response:

Provide a *post-project or post-expenditure* (after implementation) description of the impacted system or process. Be sure to include the procedures used to administer the impacted system or process and how citizens will interact with the proposed system. In particular, note if the project or expenditure makes use of information technology in reengineering traditional government processes.

Response:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Reengineering Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- Minimal use of information technology to reengineer government processes (0-3 points).
- Moderate use of information technology to reengineer government processes (4-6 points).
- Significant use of information technology to reengineer government processes (7-10).

B. Timeline

Provide a projected timeline for the Design phase of the project. Include such items as **start date, projected end date**, planning, and database design. Also include the parties responsible for each item.

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Design Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- The timeline contains several problem areas (0-3 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with few problem areas (4-6 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with no problem areas (7-10).

C. Spending plan

Explain how the funds will be allocated.

D. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits

Respond to the following and transfer data to the Design Financial Benefit Worksheet, # 5 below and the Implementation Financial Benefit Worksheet, # IV E3, as necessary:

1. One Year Pre-Project Cost - This section should be completed only if state government operations costs are expected to be reduced as a result of project implementation. **Quantify actual state government direct and indirect costs** (personnel, support, equipment, etc.) associated with the activity, system or process prior to project implementation.

Describe One Year Pre-Project Cost:

Quantify One Year Pre-Project Cost:

	State Total
FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):	\$
Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):	\$
Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):	\$
Total One Year Pre-Project Cost:	\$

2. One Year Post-Project Cost - This section should be completed only if state government operations costs are expected to be reduced as a result of project implementation. **Quantify actual state government direct and indirect costs** (personnel, support, equipment, etc.) associated with the activity, system or process after project implementation.

Describe One Year Post-Project Cost:

Quantify One Year Post-Project Cost:

	State Total
FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):	\$
Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):	\$
Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):	\$
Total One Year Post-Project Cost:	\$

3. One Year Citizen Benefit - Quantify the estimated one year value of the project to Iowa citizens. This includes the "hard cost" value of avoiding expenses ("hidden taxes") related to conducting business with State government. These expenses may be of a personal or business nature. They could be related to transportation, the time expended on the manual processing of governmental paperwork such as licenses or applications, taking time off work, mailing, or other similar expenses. As a "rule of thumb," use a value of \$10 per hour for citizen time.

Describe savings justification:

<u>Transaction Savings</u>	
Number of annual online transactions:	
Hours saved/transaction:	
Number of Citizens affected:	
Value of Citizen Hour	\$
Total Transaction Savings:	\$
Other Savings (Describe)	\$
Total One Year Citizen Benefit :	\$

4. Opportunity Value/Risk or Loss Avoidance - Quantify the estimated one year non-operations benefit to State government. This could include such items as qualifying for additional matching funds, avoiding the loss of matching funds, avoiding program penalties/sanctions or interest charges, avoiding risks to health/security/safety, avoiding the consequences of not complying with State or Federal laws, providing enhanced services, avoiding the consequences of not complying with enterprise technology standards, etc

Response:

5. Design Financial Benefit Worksheet

A. Total One Year Pre-Project cost (Section III D1):	\$	
B. Total One Year Post-Project cost (Section III D2):	\$	
C. State Government Benefit (= A-B):		\$
D. One Year Citizen Benefit (Section III D3):		\$
E. Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit (Section III D4):		\$
F. Total Design Benefit (C+D+E)	\$	
G. Annual Prorated Cost (From Budget Table, Section IV C):	\$	
Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) =		
Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100		

6. Benefits Not Readily Quantifiable - List and summarize the overall non-quantifiable benefits (i.e., IT innovation, unique system application, utilization of new technology, hidden taxes, improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, meeting a strategic goal, etc.).

Response:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Design Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)

- The financial analysis contains several questionable entries and provides minimal financial benefit to citizens (0-5 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with few questionable entries and provides a moderate financial benefit to citizens (6-10 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with no problem areas and provides maximum financial benefit to citizens (11-15).



Part IV – Implementation Funding

Amount of Implementation Funding Requested: \$278,520

Amount of Hosting Requested: \$ 13,520

\$292,040

Note: Projects developed by DAS-ITE allow first year of hosting charges

A. Timeline

Provide a projected timeline for the Implementation phase of the project. Include such items as **start date**, coding, testing, deployment, conversion, parallel installation, and **projected date of final release**. Also include the parties responsible for each item.

Response:

Start date:	7/8	Proj. Mgr; Development Resource;
Coding:	7/8	Development Resource
Data migration:	1/9	Development Resource; Technical Architect; Customer
Testing:	1/9	Tester; Development Resource; Proj. Mgr.
Deployment:	2/9	Development Resource; Technical Architect; Proj. Mgr
Projected Completion Date:	2/9	Development Resource; Proj. Mgr

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]
Implementation Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- The timeline contains several problem areas (0-3 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with few problem areas (4-6 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with no problem areas (7-10).



B. Funding Requirements

On a fiscal year basis, enter the estimated cost by funding source: Be sure to include developmental costs and ongoing costs, such as those for hosting the site, maintenance, upgrades.

	Current 2009		Current 2010		Current 2011	
	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost
State General Fund	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Pooled Tech. Fund /IOWAccess Fund	\$283,027	0%	\$9,013	0%	\$0	0%
Federal Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Local Gov. Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Grant or Private Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%

Other Funds (Specify)	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Total Project Cost	\$283,027	100%	\$9,013	100%	\$	100%
Non-Pooled Tech./Non-IOWAccess Total	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Implementation Funding Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- The funding request contains questionable items (0-3 points).
- The funding request seems reasonable with few questionable items (4-6 points).
- The funding request seems reasonable with no problem areas (7-10).



C. Project Budget Table

It is necessary to estimate and assign a useful life figure to each cost identified in the project budget. Useful life is the amount of time that project-related equipment, products, or services are utilized before they are updated or replaced. In general, the useful life of hardware is three (3) years and the useful life of software is four (4) years. Depending upon the nature of the expense, the useful life for other project costs will vary between one (1) and four (4) years. On an exception basis, the useful life of individual project elements or the project as a whole may exceed four (4) years.

The Total Annual Prorated Cost (State Share) will be calculated based on the following equation:

$$\left[\left(\frac{\text{Budget Amount}}{\text{Useful Life}} \right) \times \% \text{ State Share} \right] + (\text{Annual Ongoing Cost} \times \% \text{ State Share}) = \text{Annual Prorated Cost}$$

Budget Line Items	Budget Amount (1 st Year Cost)	Useful Life (Years)	% State Share	Annual Ongoing Cost (After 1 st Year)	% State Share	Annual Prorated Cost
Agency Staff	\$ 93,756	1	100	\$82,756	100%	\$
Software	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Hardware	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Training	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Facilities	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Professional Services	\$		%	\$	%	\$
ITE Services	\$292,040	5	100%	\$	%	\$58,408
Supplies, Maint., etc.	\$ 3,000	1	100%	\$ 3,000	%	\$
Other	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Totals	\$388,796		100 %	\$85,756	100 %	\$58,408

D. Spending plan

Explain how the funds will be allocated.

E. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits

Respond to the following and transfer data to the Implementation Financial Benefit Worksheet, #3 below, as necessary:

1. Opportunity Value/Risk or Loss Avoidance – Quantify the estimated annual non-operations benefit to State government. This could include such items as qualifying for additional matching funds, avoiding the loss of matching funds, avoiding program penalties/sanctions or interest charges, avoiding risks to health/security/safety, avoiding the consequences of not complying with State or Federal laws, providing enhanced services, avoiding the consequences of not complying with enterprise technology standards, etc.

Response: See below worksheet

2. Benefits Not Readily Quantifiable – List and summarize the overall non-quantifiable benefits (i.e., IT innovation, unique system application, utilization of new technology, hidden taxes, improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, meeting a strategic goal, etc.).

Response:

- **Enhancing service to existing and prospective business**
- **Utilization of new IT technology;**
- **Reducing unnecessary regulatory delays**
- **Reducing costs of compliance**
- **Increasing business focus on core activities rather than compliance**
- **Increasing compliance rates**

3. Implementation Financial Benefit Worksheet

A. Total One Year Pre-Project cost (Section III D1):	\$96756	
B. Total One Year Post-Project cost (Section III D2):	\$85756	
C. State Government Benefit (= A-B):		\$11000
D. One Year Citizen Benefit (Section III D3):		\$58996
E. Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit (Section III D4):		\$
F. Total Design Benefit (C+D+E)	\$69996	
G. Annual Prorated Cost (From Budget Table, Section IV C):	\$25000	
Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) =	2.79	
Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100	12.6978	

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Implementation Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)

- The financial analysis contains several questionable entries and provides minimal financial benefit to citizens (0-5 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with few questionable entries and provides a moderate financial benefit to citizens (6-10 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with no problem areas and provides maximum financial benefit to citizens (11-15).



Evaluation Summary

[This section to be completed by application evaluator.]

Design Phase:

Requirements/Compliance Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Impact Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Customer Service Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scope Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Funds Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reengineering Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Design Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Design Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>TOTAL DESIGN EVALUATION</u> (90 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>

Implementation Phase:

Implementation Timeline Evaluation (10Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Implementation Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Implementation Funding Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>TOTAL IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION</u> (35 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part V – Auditable Outcome Measures

For each of the following categories, list the auditable metrics for success after implementation and identify how they will be measured.

1. Improved customer service

Response: Information will be more readily accessible.

2. Citizen impact

Response: Citizens will have complete and accurate information available 24/7.

3. Cost Savings

Response: Decreasing the amount of 'down time' and 'frustration' for citizens or business users of BLIC and improving the clarity of information is very valuable.

4. Project reengineering

Response:

5. Source of funds (Budget %)

Response:

6. Tangible/Intangible benefits

Response: Current, update to date BLIC information will result in fewer calls to departments within the State thereby allowing State employees to focus on other business.



IOWAccess Advisory Council

IOWAccess Revolving Fund Project Application

Proposing agencies should complete and submit Parts I, II and III to request Planning approval, then complete and submit Parts IV and V to request Execution approval.

Part I - Project Information

Date:	April 24, 2008
Agency Name:	Department of Natural Resources
Project Name:	Hazardous Material Spills Website
Agency Manager:	Adam Broughton
Agency Manager Phone Number / E-Mail:	515/725-0386 adam.broughton@dnr.iowa.gov
Executive Sponsor (Agency Director or Planningee):	
Initial Total for Planning:	\$
Initial Total for Execution:	\$280,000.00
Initial Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:	\$
Project Timeline: (estimate start and end dates for project spending)	Planning Start Date: Planning End Date: Execution Start Date: May 7, 2008 Execution End Date: January, 2009
Revised Total for Planning and Execution:	\$335,000.00
Revised Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:	\$

Part II - Project Overview

A. Project Summary: Describe the nature and use of the proposed project, including what is to be accomplished, how it will be accomplished, and what the costs and benefits will be.

Response:

This application will be used to perform the following:

1. Report hazardous spills
2. Gather additional information concerning the spills from both the DNR and the responsible parties
3. Provide reports to the public
4. Migrate data from 3 databases into one
5. Connect to the four state HERE information exchange portal
6. Connect to and utilize the DNR One Stop database

The reporting and updating of information will be accomplished using a new website written in .NET language.

The databases will be migrated from Access and Paradox to a SQL database.

Reports will be made available through the website. The reports will not be canned reports in that the user may select the dates and type of report. Reports may be saved as an Excel spreadsheet.

B. Strategic Plan: How does the proposed project fit into the strategic plan of the requesting agency?

Response:

DNR is proactively providing easier access to information to the public, regulated parties, and local emergency response officials. The project will also provide the tools to make it easier for DNR personnel to perform their duties more efficiently, with better accuracy and quicker, better response to the public.

C. Current Technology: Provide a summary of the technology used by the current system. How does the proposed project impact the agency's technological direction? Are programming elements consistent with a Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) approach? Are programming elements consistent with existing enterprise standards?

Response:

The current system uses an Access Database. The current website contains a page on the DNR website which includes reports in pdf format and links to forms and information currently generated monthly by DNR personnel. The reports are not customized for individual public use. The current system allows DNR employees to input the preliminary spill report, but no follow-up information or reports. However, due to Access database constraints, each field office is limited to using the application one hour of each day. Only one user at a time may access the application.

The proposed project will conform to the new direction being implemented by DNR. The application will submit information to the DNR One Stop application as well as obtain information such as location latitude and longitude from the One Stop application.

The programming elements are very consistent with the SOA approach and are consistent with enterprise standards. The application will also submit information to the four state Heartland Emergency Response Exchange (HERE) project which is designed to provide local and state emergency planners with cross

border hazard information. The revision will allow the application to use the new DNR website look and feel.

D. Statutory or Other Requirements

Is this project or expenditure necessary for compliance with a Federal law, rule, or order?

YES (If "Yes", cite the specific Federal law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is impacted by it.)

Response:

Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act (EPCRA) Section 304, 40 CFR 355 requires facilities to provide emergency notification and a written follow-up notice to the State Emergency Response Commission (SERC) if there is a release into the environment of a hazardous substance that is equal to or exceeds the minimum reportable quantity set in the regulations. The DNR is tasked with receiving these notifications on behalf of the SERC.

Is this project or expenditure required by state law, rule or order?

YES (If "YES", cite the specific state law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is impacted by it.)

Response:

Iowa Administrative Code (567 IAC 131.2) requires any person manufacturing, storing, handling, transporting or disposing of a hazardous substance to notify this department of the occurrence of a hazardous condition. In Chapter 131 "*Hazardous Condition*" means any situation involving the actual, imminent or probable spillage, leakage, or release of a hazardous substance onto the land, into a water of the state or into the atmosphere which, because of quantity, strength and toxicity of the hazardous substance, its mobility in the environment and its persistence, creates an immediate or potential danger to the public health or safety or to the environment.

Does this project or expenditure meet a health, safety or security requirement?

YES (If "YES", explain.)

Response:

Responsible parties are required to report all spills that create an immediate or potential danger to the public health or safety or to the environment as outlined in Iowa Code. DNR personnel may investigate any spill which is considered hazardous to the environment and/or people and animals. Information collected by this application will also support the efforts of the Iowa Department of Public Health's Hazardous Substances Emergency Events Surveillance program.

Is this project or expenditure necessary for compliance with an enterprise technology standard?

YES (If "YES", cite the specific standard.)

Response:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Requirements/Compliance Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)

If the answer to these criteria is "no," the point value is zero (0). Depending upon how directly a qualifying project or expenditure may relate to a particular requirement (federal mandate, state mandate, health-safety-security issue, or compliance with an enterprise technology standard), or satisfies more than one requirement (e.g. it is mandated by state and federal law and fulfills a health and safety mandate), 1-15 points awarded.



E. Impact on Iowa's Citizens

1. Project Participants - List the project participants (i.e. single agency, multiple agencies, State government enterprise, citizens, associations, or businesses, other levels of government, etc.) and provide commentary concerning the nature of participant involvement. Be sure to specify who and how many **direct** users the system will impact. Also specify whether the system will be of use to other interested parties: who they may be, how many people are estimated, and how they will use the system.

Response:

Project Participants – DNR personnel, public, associations, businesses, and other levels of government.

The new application will affect DNR personnel, government agencies, public and other interested groups.

DNR personnel and the person(s) responsible for a hazardous spill will be affected directly as the application will enhance the methods used to input and gather data.

At this time, DNR personnel accept calls reporting a hazardous spill. The information is entered into the system. The current system allows DNR personnel access during a one hour period at specified periods of time during the day. This results in the employee writing down the information and entering the information at a later time. The new application will provide DNR personnel with the ability to enter the information as it is being relayed.

The responsible party must then submit a written follow-up report. DNR personnel may also submit additional information from spill investigations. These pieces of information are currently not tracked electronically. The new application will allow both DNR and the responsible party the ability to enter data online as well as submit supporting documentation such as documents and pictures on line. Data which has been previously entered will populate the corresponding fields in the additional reports thus saving everyone time and effort.

The public and all interested parties will be allowed to select the time period for each available report thus providing more timely and complete information. This will be very helpful to government agencies, special interest groups, developers and real estate agencies.

2. Service Improvements - Summarize the extent to which the project or expenditure improves service to Iowa citizens or within State government. Included would be such items as improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, providing enhanced services, improving work processes, etc.

Response:

The new application will greatly enhance the interaction the citizen has with the Department of Natural Resources.

DNR personnel may input data at any time rather than having to wait for their designated hour. This will greatly reduce the amount of time spent manually gathering information to input into the application. This application will allow the input of follow-up reports and information not previously tracked in the current application. This will also enable personnel to quickly perform a search at any time of the day.

This application will enable the citizen to obtain timely reports, provide documentation in a timelier manner and provide a much easier means to input data and update spill information. This will also enable the public to obtain the reports they need for the specific time period that is needed without needing to contact DNR. These reports will be available at any time. The addition of information

not previous tracked electronically will improve the completeness of information provided to the public via the internet.

3. Citizen Impact – Summarize how the project leads to a more informed citizenry, facilitates accountability, and encourages participatory democracy. If this is an extension of another project, what has been the adoption rate of Iowa's citizens or government employees with the preceding project?

Response:

Public will have the opportunity to obtain timely, complete reports. The application will allow the public to view data graphically through its interface with the DNR's One-Stop geographical information system. Public officials and emergency planners will also be able to view and share this information through the applications connection to the four-state Heartland Emergency Response Exchange system. This will also enable DNR to provide statistics to the public and other government agencies based on more reliable data.

4. Public Health and/or Safety – Explain requirements or impact on the health and safety of the public.

Response:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Impact Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)

- Minimally directly impacts Iowa citizens (0-5 points).
- Moderately directly impacts Iowa citizens (6-10 points).
- Significantly directly impacts Iowa citizens (11-15 points).

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Customer Service Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- Minimally improves customer service (0-3 points).
- Moderately improves customer service (4-6 points).
- Significantly improves customer service (7-10 points).

F. Scope

Is this project the first part of a future, larger project?

- YES (If "YES", explain.) NO, it is a stand-alone project

Response:

Is this project a continuation of a previously begun project?

YES (If "YES", explain.)

Response:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Scope Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- This is the first year of a multi-year project / expenditure or project / expenditure duration is one year (0-5 points)
- The project / expenditure is of a multi-year nature and each annual component produces a definable and stand-alone outcome, result or product (2-8 points).
- This is beyond the first year of a multi-year project / expenditure (6-10 points)

The last part of this criteria involves rating the extent to which a project or expenditure is at an advanced stage of Execution and termination of the project / expenditure would waste previously invested resources.

G. Source of Funds

On a fiscal year basis, how much of the total project cost (\$ amount and %) would be absorbed by your agency from non-Pooled Technology/IOWAccess funds? If desired, provide additional comment / response below.

Response:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Funds Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)

- 0% (0 points)
- 1%-12% (1 point)
- 13%-25% (2 points)
- 25%-38% (3 points)
- 39%-50% (4 points)
- Over 50% (5 points)

Part III – Planning Proposal

Amount of Planning Funding Requested: \$

A. Process Reengineering

Provide a *pre-project or pre-expenditure* (before Execution) description of the impacted system or process. Be sure to include the procedures used to administer the impacted system or process and how citizens interact with the current system.

1. **Response:**

Provide a *post-project or post-expenditure* (after Execution) description of the impacted system or process. Be sure to include the procedures used to administer the impacted system or process and how citizens will interact with the proposed system. In particular, note if the project or expenditure makes use of information technology in reengineering traditional government processes.

Response:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Reengineering Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- Minimal use of information technology to reengineer government processes (0-3 points).
- Moderate use of information technology to reengineer government processes (4-6 points).
- Significant use of information technology to reengineer government processes (7-10).



B. Timeline

Provide a projected timeline for the Planning phase of the project. Include such items as **start date, projected end date**, planning, and database Planning. Also include the parties responsible for each item.

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Planning Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- The timeline contains several problem areas (0-3 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with few problem areas (4-6 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with no problem areas (7-10).



C. Spending plan

D. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits

Respond to the following and transfer data to the **Planning Financial Benefit Worksheet, # 5 below and the Execution Financial Benefit Worksheet, # IV E3, as necessary:**

1. One Year Pre-Project Cost - This section should be completed only if state government operations costs are expected to be reduced as a result of project Execution. **Quantify actual state government direct and indirect costs** (personnel, support, equipment, etc.) associated with the activity, system or process prior to project Execution.

Describe One Year Pre-Project Cost:

Quantify One Year Pre-Project Cost:

	State Total
FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):	
Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):	
Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):	
Total One Year Pre-Project Cost:	

2. One Year Post-Project Cost - This section should be completed only if state government operations costs are expected to be reduced as a result of project Execution. **Quantify actual state government direct and indirect costs** (personnel, support, equipment, etc.) associated with the activity, system or process after project Execution.

Describe One Year Post-Project Cost:

Quantify One Year Post-Project Cost:

	State Total
FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):	\$0.00
Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):	\$0.00
Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):	\$0.00
Total One Year Post-Project Cost:	\$0.00

3. One Year Citizen Benefit - Quantify the estimated one year value of the project to Iowa citizens. This includes the "hard cost" value of avoiding expenses ("hidden taxes") related to conducting business with State government. These expenses may be of a personal or business nature. They could be related to transportation, the time expended on the manual processing of governmental paperwork such as licenses or applications, taking time off work, mailing, or other similar expenses. As a "rule of thumb," use a value of \$10 per hour for citizen time.

Describe savings justification:

Transaction Savings (Record Center Costs)	
Number of annual record center spill file transactions:	
Hours saved/transaction:	
Number of Citizens affected:	
Cost of Search Time:	
Total Transaction Savings:	
Other Savings (Describe)	
Total Savings:	

4. Opportunity Value/Risk or Loss Avoidance - Quantify the estimated one year non-operations benefit to State government. This could include such items as qualifying for additional matching funds, avoiding the loss of matching funds, avoiding program penalties/sanctions or interest charges, avoiding risks to health/security/safety, avoiding the consequences of not complying with State or Federal laws, providing enhanced services, avoiding the consequences of not complying with enterprise technology standards, etc

Response:

5. Planning Financial Benefit Worksheet

A. Total One Year Pre-Project cost (Section III D1):		
B. Total One Year Post-Project cost (Section III D2):		
C. State Government Benefit (= A-B):		
D. One Year Citizen Benefit (Section III D3):		
E. Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit (Section III D4):		
F. Total Planning Benefit (C+D+E)		
G. Annual Prorated Cost (From Budget Table, Section IV C):		
Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) =		
Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100		

6. Benefits Not Readily Quantifiable - List and summarize the overall non-quantifiable benefits (i.e., IT innovation, unique system application, utilization of new technology, hidden taxes, improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, meeting a strategic goal, etc.).

Response:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Planning Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)

- The financial analysis contains several questionable entries and provides minimal financial benefit to citizens (0-5 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with few questionable entries and provides a moderate financial benefit to citizens (6-10 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with no problem areas and provides maximum financial benefit to citizens (11-15).



Part IV – Execution Funding

Amount of Execution Funding Requested: \$280,000.00

Amount of Hosting Requested: \$0

Note: Projects developed by DAS-ITE allow first year of hosting charges

A. Timeline

Provide a projected timeline for the Execution phase of the project. Include such items as **start date**, coding, testing, deployment, conversion, parallel installation, and **projected date of final release**. Also include the parties responsible for each item.

Response: Start Date – May 7, 2008
Coding – May 21, 2008 (ITE)
Page creations – May 8, 2008 (ITE)
Testing – July 1, 2008 (ITE)
Deployment to production – Dec 30, 2008 (ITE)
Database conversion – Sept 1, 2008 (ITE)
Projected Date of Final Release – Dec 31, 2008

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Execution Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- The timeline contains several problem areas (0-3 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with few problem areas (4-6 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with no problem areas (7-10).



B. Funding Requirements

On a fiscal year basis, enter the estimated cost by funding source: Be sure to include developmental costs and ongoing costs, such as those for hosting the site, maintenance, upgrades.

	Current FY		Current FY +1		Current FY +2	
	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost
State General Fund	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Pooled Tech. Fund /IOWAccess Fund	\$280,000.00	100	\$6744.00	100	\$0	0%
Federal Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Local Gov. Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Grant or Private Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Other Funds (Specify)	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Total Project Cost	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Non-Pooled Tech./Non-IOWAccess Total	\$280,000	100%	\$6744.00	100%	\$0	0%

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Execution Funding Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- The funding request contains questionable items (0-3 points).
- The funding request seems reasonable with few questionable items (4-6 points).
- The funding request seems reasonable with no problem areas (7-10).



C. Project Budget Table

It is necessary to estimate and assign a useful life figure to each cost identified in the project budget. Useful life is the amount of time that project-related equipment, products, or services are utilized before they are updated or replaced. In general, the useful life of hardware is three (3) years and the useful life of software is four (4) years. Depending upon the nature of the expense, the useful life for other project costs will vary between one (1) and four (4) years. On an exception basis, the useful life of individual project elements or the project as a whole may exceed four (4) years.

The Total Annual Prorated Cost (State Share) will be calculated based on the following equation:

$$\left[\left(\frac{\text{Budget Amount}}{\text{Useful Life}} \right) \times \% \text{ State Share} \right] + (\text{Annual Ongoing Cost} \times \% \text{ State Share}) = \text{Annual Prorated Cost}$$

Budget Line Items	Budget Amount (1 st Year Cost)	Useful Life (Years)	% State Share	Annual Ongoing Cost (After 1 st Year)	% State Share	Annual Prorated Cost
Agency Staff	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Software	\$280000	4	25%	\$6744.00	100%	\$76744
Hardware	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Training	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Facilities	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Professional Services	\$		%	\$	%	\$
ITE Services	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Supplies, Maint., etc.	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Other	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Totals	\$280000	4	25 %	\$6744	100 %	\$76744

D. Spending plan

The funds will be used to complete the Execution Phase of the project. Execution will include development of database with web portal and migration of data from existing and historic databases into the newly created database.

E. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits

Respond to the following and transfer data to the Execution Financial Benefit Worksheet, #3 below, as necessary:

1. Opportunity Value/Risk or Loss Avoidance – Quantify the estimated annual non-operations benefit to State government. This could include such items as qualifying for additional matching funds, avoiding the loss of matching funds, avoiding program penalties/sanctions or interest charges, avoiding risks to health/security/safety, avoiding the consequences of not complying with State or Federal laws, providing enhanced services, avoiding the consequences of not complying with enterprise technology standards, etc.

Response:

Individuals or industry involved in an incident that creates a hazardous condition are required to report all spills that create an immediate or potential danger to the public health or safety or to the

environment as outlined in Iowa Code. DNR personnel may investigate any spill which is considered hazardous to the environment and/or people and animals based on the information received. Having timely and complete information will allow for the most productive use of limited resources.

Public will have the opportunity to obtain timely, complete reports on spills in their area, impact or potential impact to the environment in their area, and the actions taken to prevent or mitigate that impact. The public will also have easy access to information that will aid in choosing where to live or develop property.

The information is used by local, state, and federal government agencies to plan, apply for and allocate grants, and analyze incidents for a variety of purposes. The information is also used by Iowa Department of Public Health's Hazardous Substances Emergency Events Surveillance program to track incidents that impact public health. Information collected by this application will also support the efforts of the Iowa Department of Public Health's Hazardous Substances Emergency Events Surveillance program.

2. Benefits Not Readily Quantifiable – List and summarize the overall non-quantifiable benefits (i.e., IT innovation, unique system application, utilization of new technology, hidden taxes, improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, meeting a strategic goal, etc.).

Response:

This web application will allow local, state, and federal government agencies to easily obtain the information that is needed for required reporting, emergency planning, and internal information. This web application will also allow citizens the opportunity to be more aware of the condition of the environment where they live and help them select a safe place to raise their family through easy access to current and historical spill data in a searchable format. Through the linkages to the One-Stop program information stored in the web application is linked to information from other sources. This allows the public to view information from several programs geographically and allows DNR personnel to confirm incident location quickly and accurately. Through linkages with the Heartland Emergency Response Exchange program local officials, first responders, and emergency planners can utilize information not only in Iowa but the four other participating states for planning and grant proposals.

3. Execution Financial Benefit Worksheet

A. Total One Year Pre-Project cost (Section III D1):	\$6,959	
B. Total One Year Post-Project cost (Section III D2):	\$0	
C. State Government Benefit (= A-B):		\$ 6,959
D. One Year Citizen Benefit (Section III D3):		\$ 2,880
E. Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit (Section III D4):		\$0
F. Total Planning Benefit (C+D+E)	\$9,839	
G. Annual Prorated Cost (From Budget Table, Section IV C):	\$76744	
Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) =	.128	
Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100	-23.89	

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Execution Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)

- The financial analysis contains several questionable entries and provides minimal financial benefit to citizens (0-5 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with few questionable entries and provides a moderate financial benefit to citizens (6-10 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with no problem areas and provides maximum financial benefit to citizens (11-15).



Evaluation Summary

[This section to be completed by application evaluator.]

Planning Phase:

Requirements/Compliance Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Impact Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Customer Service Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scope Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Funds Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reengineering Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Planning Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Planning Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>TOTAL PLANNING EVALUATION</u> (90 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>

Execution Phase:

Execution Timeline Evaluation (10Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Execution Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Execution Funding Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>TOTAL EXECUTION EVALUATION</u> (35 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part V – Auditable Outcome Measures

For each of the following categories, list the auditable metrics for success after Execution and identify how they will be measured.

1. Improved customer service

Response:

2. Citizen impact

Response:

3. Cost Savings

Response:

Salaries of the DNR personnel who currently are required to gather information and produce reports for government agencies, news media and interested public.

The amount of time the personnel spent on these projects before implementation will be compared to the amount of time personnel spend on the tasks after implementation. DNR expects to see a great reduction in the time spent on the tasks.

4. Project reengineering

Response:

This allows multiple persons to access the website concurrently. At this time, DNR employees must section the time period that each Field Office or the DNR Emergency Response Team may access the data.

Personnel will be able to simultaneously access the project. The amount of time spent waiting for the application to be available is hard to determine.

5. Source of funds (Budget %)

Response:

6. Tangible/Intangible benefits

Response:

Project Tracking No.: 10260

Return on Investment (ROI) Program Funding Application

This template was built using the ITE ROI Submission Intranet application.
FINAL AUDIT REQUIRED: The Enterprise Quality Assurance Office of the Information Technology Enterprise is required to perform post implementation outcome audits for all Pooled Technology funded projects and may perform audits on other projects.

This is an IOWAccess Revolving Fund Request.

Amount of funding requested: Currently: Implementation Cost \$216,000

Anticipated total: \$339,000: **<\$19,900 (Scope Done)** + \$ 64,000 Proof-of Concept + \$216,000 Implementation Estimate.

Section I: Proposal

Date:	6/18/2008
Agency Name:	IDOM
Project Name:	DOM Local Gov Budgets & Reports
Agency Manager:	Jim Nervig
Agency Manager Phone Number / E-Mail:	515.242.5240
Executive Sponsor (Agency Director or Designee):	Dick Oshlo – 515.281.5201
IOWAccess Project Process Phase:	<input type="checkbox"/> Scope Analysis <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Design <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation

A. Project Summary: Describe the nature and use of the proposed project, including what is to be accomplished, how it will be accomplished, and what the costs and benefits will be.

To establish a centralized database and application with Internet accessibility that would allow local government authorities to prepare and certify budgets and submit annual financial reports each year. The target is to provide functionality and features at least comparable to the existing Excel spreadsheets currently used. This architecture will eliminate the current process of submitting budget via email and writing of valuation data that can introduce errors and dropped data.

Importantly, the goal is also to make budget and annual financial report information available on-line to our citizens as soon as the data is reported by the local government authority and make county and other local government budget

and annual report information available to the general public for legal and other purposes, accessible at any time, day or night.

B. Strategic Plan: How does the proposed project fit into the strategic plan of the requesting agency?

This project will provide the General Public and other interested parties to view local government budget and annual financial report information from any location with Internet access. Currently, this information is only available by contacting each government entity and requesting paper copies of budgets.

This project will significantly enhance openness in local government finances.

C. Current Technology: Provide a summary of the technology used by the current system. How does the proposed project impact the agency's technological direction? Are programming elements consistent with a Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) approach? Are programming elements consistent with existing enterprise standards?

The current system is two-fold: 1) a Customer-side customized Excel Workbook, and 2) a State-side Microsoft Windows-based application which accesses a Microsoft SQL SERVER Database.

The Excel workbook is modified each year to incorporate any statutory changes, and is then published on the IDOM WEBSITE to be downloaded by the users. Upon completion by the users the Workbook is sent via email to IDOM.

The State application is modified each year to incorporate the new Fiscal Year and any changes to the application as required by statute. Upon receipt of the County-side Excel Workbooks, the State-side application is utilized to import the data from the Excel Workbooks to the SQL Server. The State application can then be utilized to verify and modify (as required) the imported data, and to develop reports as needed.

D. Statutory or Other Requirements

Is this project or expenditure necessary for compliance with a Federal law, rule, or order?

YES (If "Yes", cite the specific Federal law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is impacted by it.)

Explanation:

Is this project or expenditure required by state law, rule or order?

YES (If "YES", cite the specific state law, rule or order, with a short explanation

of how this project is impacted by it.)

Explanation:

Legislation passed during the 2007 Legislative session requires the Department of Management (DOM) to make County budget information by “electronic means.” This project will satisfy that requirement and expand it to other government budgets and annual financial reports.

Does this project or expenditure meet a health, safety or security requirement?

YES (If "YES", explain.)

Explanation:

Is this project or expenditure necessary for compliance with an enterprise technology standard?

YES (If "YES", cite the specific standard.)

Explanation:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)

If the answer to these criteria is "no," the point value is zero (0). Depending upon how directly a qualifying project or expenditure may relate to a particular requirement (federal mandate, state mandate, health-safety-security issue, or compliance with an enterprise technology standard), or satisfies more than one requirement (e.g. it is mandated by state and federal law and fulfills a health and safety mandate), 1-15 points awarded.



E. Impact on Iowa's Citizens 1. Project Participants - List the project participants (i.e. single agency, multiple agencies, State government enterprise, citizens, associations, or businesses, other levels of government, etc.) and provide commentary concerning the nature of participant involvement. Be sure to specify who and how many **direct** users the system will impact. Also specify whether the system will be of use to other interested parties: who they may be, how many people are estimated, and how they will use the system.

- All citizens of Iowa will be able to use the website to access budget and annual financial report information for local governments in Iowa.
- Local government officials will use the website site to prepare and submit their annual budgets and financial reports. This will include 99 counties, 100 agricultural extension districts, 107 county and city assessors, 45 county hospitals, 58 benefited fire districts, approximately 50 other local benefited districts and about 1,600 townships.
- The 99 County Auditors will use the website to review and certify local government budgets.

- The DOM will use the website to prepare and certify tax levies to County Auditors, perform analysis on local government financial data and provide information to others.
- Other State Agencies, including the Department of Human Services, the Legislative Services Agency, and the Auditor of State will use data provided by the website for analysis local government finances.
- Outside organizations, including Iowa State Association of Counties and the Iowa Farm Bureau will use data provided by the website for various analysis purposes.

2. Service Improvements - Summarize the extent to which the project or expenditure improves service to Iowa citizens or within State government. Included would be such items as improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, providing enhanced services, improving work processes, etc.

- Provide citizens immediate internet access to financial information for any local government without having to contact each one individually.
- Provide local governments with a web-based budget application that doesn't require any additional software beyond a web browser and internet connection to use.
- All local government budgets will automatically be entered into a database without any further action by DOM staff.

3. Citizen Impact – Summarize how the project leads to a more informed citizenry, facilitates accountability, and encourages participatory democracy. If this is an extension of another project, what has been the adoption rate of Iowa's citizens or government employees with the preceding project?

- All citizens of Iowa will be able to use the website to access budget and annual financial report information for local governments in Iowa.

4. Public Health and/or Safety – Explain requirements or impact on the health and safety of the public.

<p>[This section to be scored by application evaluator.] Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimally directly impacts Iowa citizens (0-5 points). • Moderately directly impacts Iowa citizens (6-10 points). • Significantly directly impacts Iowa citizens (11-15 points). 	
---	---

<p>[This section to be scored by application evaluator.] Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)</p>	
--	---

- Minimally improves customer service (0-3 points).
- Moderately improves customer service (4-6 points).
- Significantly improves customer service (7-10 points).



F. Process Reengineering

Provide a pre-project or pre-expenditure (before implementation) description of the impacted system or process. Be sure to include the procedures used to administer the impacted system or process and how citizens interact with the current system.

Response:

Currently the DOM prepares budget and annual report Excel Files and posts them to the DOM website for downloading. Once the local government has completed the budget, a Notice of Public hearing providing summary budget and tax information and the time and place of the required public hearing on the budget is published in local newspapers. At this time the budget detail is to be made available, at the offices of the local government, for citizens to review.

Following the budget public hearing and after the local government has adopted the budget, the Excel file is emailed to the DOM and two paper copies are given to the County Auditor. After the County Auditor reviews and certifies the budget, they mail one paper copy to DOM. County Budgets are loaded into a database by DOM and are reviewed for errors. The other budgets are reviewed manually by DOM and any necessary corrections made.

Once budgets are final, data is pulled from the county database for counties and from individual Excel budget files for other governments. The data is uploaded into an ITE mainframe application and tax levy certifications are generated and distributed to County Auditors.

County Annual reports are submitted via email and loaded into a database by DOM staff. The database is distributed via database to other interested parties, including the Department of Human Services, Legislative Service Agency and the Iowa Farm Bureau. Any database changes require the database to be reloaded.

Provide a post-project or post-expenditure (after implementation) description of the impacted system or process. Be sure to include the procedures used to administer the impacted system or process and how citizens will interact with the proposed system. In particular, note if the project or expenditure makes use of information technology in reengineering traditional government processes.

Response:

The new budget submission will simplify the submission process. The budget will be entered online, into a database created by this project. Once the budget hearing notice is done, the budget will be open for review by citizens and other

interested parties. Once the final budget is adopted, the County Auditor will be notified and will be able to review and certify the budget. When the County Auditor has certified the budget, the DOM will be notified. Once DOM has reviewed the budgets and made any necessary corrections, certified tax levies can be issued to County Auditors.

The final budget and annual financial reports will be available online for anyone to see.

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- Minimal use of information technology to reengineer government processes (0-3 points).
- Moderate use of information technology to reengineer government processes (4-6 points).
- Significant use of information technology to reengineer government processes (7-10).



G. **Timeline** Provide a projected timeline for this project. Include such items as **start date**, planning, database design, coding, implementation, testing, conversion, parallel installation, and date of final release. Also include the parties responsible for each item.

Scope	Done		
Proof-Of-Concept	July	2008	ITE & DOM
(Implement Reports & Proof Budgets)			
Request Implementation funding	July	2008	DOM
Design / Implement Budgets	Dec	2008	ITE & DOM
Design / Implement Full reports	Mar	2009	ITE

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- The timeline contains several problem areas (0-3 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with few problem areas (4-6 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with no problem areas (7-10).



H. Funding Requirements

On a fiscal year basis, enter the estimated cost by funding source: Be sure to include developmental costs and ongoing costs, such as those for hosting the site, maintenance, upgrades.

	FY07		FY08		FY09	
	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost
State General Fund	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Pooled Tech. Fund /IOWAccess Fund	\$0	0%	\$216,000	0%	\$0	0%
Federal Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Local Gov. Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Grant or Private Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Other Funds (Specify)	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Total Project Cost	\$0	0%	\$216,000	0%	\$0	0%
Non-Pooled Tech. Total	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- The funding request contains questionable items (0-3 points).
- The funding request seems reasonable with few questionable items (4-6 points).
- The funding request seems reasonable with no problem areas (7-10).



I. Scope

Is this project the first part of a future, larger project?

YES (If "YES", explain.) NO, it is a stand-alone project.

Explanation:

Future plan to include city and school district budgets.

Is this project a continuation of a previously begun project?

YES (If "YES", explain.)

Explanation:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- This is the first year of a multi-year project / expenditure or project /



expenditure duration is one year (0-5 points)

- The project / expenditure is of a multi-year nature and each annual component produces a definable and stand-alone outcome, result or product (2-8 points).
- This is beyond the first year of a multi-year project / expenditure (6-10 points)

The last part of this criteria involves rating the extent to which a project or expenditure is at an advanced stage of implementation and termination of the project / expenditure would waste previously invested resources.

J. Source of Funds

On a fiscal year basis, how much of the total project cost (\$ amount and %) would be absorbed by your agency from non-Pooled Technology and/or IOWAccess funds? If desired, provide additional comment / response below.

Response:

Ongoing website maintenance will be absorbed by DOM.

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)

- 0% (0 points)
- 1%-12% (1 point)
- 13%-25% (2 points)
- 25%-38% (3 points)
- 39%-50% (4 points)
- Over 50% (5 points)



Section II: Financial Analysis

A. Project Budget Table

It is necessary to estimate and assign a useful life figure to each cost identified in the project budget. Useful life is the amount of time that project related equipment, products, or services are utilized before they are updated or replaced. In general, the useful life of hardware is three (3) years and the useful life of software is four (4) years. Depending upon the nature of the expense, the useful life for other project costs will vary between one (1) and four (4) years. On an exception basis, the useful life of individual project elements or the project as a whole may exceed four (4) years. Additionally, the ROI calculation must include all new annual ongoing costs that are project related.

The Total Annual Prorated Cost (State Share) will be calculated based on the following equation:

$$\left[\left(\frac{\text{Budget Amount}}{\text{Useful Life}} \right) \times \% \text{ State Share} \right] + (\text{Annual Ongoing Cost} \times \% \text{ State Share}) = \text{Annual Prorated Cost}$$

Budget Line Items	Budget Amount (1st Year Cost)	Useful Life (Years)	% State Share	Annual Ongoing Cost (After 1st Year)	% State Share	Annual Prorated Cost
Agency Staff						
Software						
Hardware						
Training						
Facilities						
Professional Services						
ITD Services	\$216,000	TBD	100	TBD		
Supplies, Maint, etc.						
Other						
Totals	\$216,000	TBD	100	TBD		

B. Spending plan

Explain how the funds will be allocated.

C. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits

Respond to the following and transfer data to the ROI Financial Worksheet as necessary:

1. Annual Pre-Project Cost - This section should be completed only if state government operations costs are expected to be reduced as a result of project implementation. **Quantify actual state government direct and indirect costs** (personnel, support, equipment, etc.) associated with the activity, system or process prior to project implementation.

Describe Annual Pre-Project Cost:
Not Applicable

Quantify Annual Pre-Project Cost:

Not Applicable

	State Total
FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):	\$0.00
Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):	\$0.00
Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect	\$0.00

costs if applicable, etc.):	
Total Annual Pre-Project Cost:	\$0.00

2. Annual Post-Project Cost - This section should be completed only if state government operations costs are expected to be reduced as a result of project implementation. **Quantify actual state government direct and indirect costs** (personnel, support, equipment, etc.) associated with the activity, system or process after project implementation.

Not Applicable

Describe Annual Post-Project Cost:

Quantify Annual Post-Project Cost:

	State Total
FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):	\$0.00
Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):	\$0.00
Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):	\$0.00
Total Annual Post-Project Cost:	\$0.00

3. Citizen Benefit - Quantify the estimated annual value of the project to Iowa citizens. This includes the "hard cost" value of avoiding expenses ("hidden taxes") related to conducting business with State government. These expenses may be of a personal or business nature. They could be related to transportation, the time expended on the manual processing of governmental paperwork such as licenses or applications, taking time off work, mailing, or other similar expenses. As a "rule of thumb," use a value of \$10 per hour for citizen time.

No "hard cost" savings

Describe savings justification:

Transaction Savings	
Number of annual online transactions:	
Hours saved/transaction:	
Number of Citizens affected:	
Value of Citizen Hour	
Total Transaction Savings:	
Other Savings (Describe)	
Total Savings:	

ROI Financial Worksheet	
A. Total Annual Pre-Project cost (State Share from Section II C1):	
B. Total Annual Post-Project cost (State Share from Section II C2):	
State Government Benefit (= A-B):	
Annual Benefit Summary:	
State Government Benefit:	
Citizen Benefit:	
Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit:	
C. Total Annual Project Benefit:	
D. Annual Prorated Cost (From Budget Table):	
Benefit / Cost Ratio: (C/D) =	
Return On Investment (ROI): ((C-D) / Requested Project Funds) * 100 =	

4. Opportunity Value/Risk or Loss Avoidance - Quantify the estimated annual non-operations benefit to State government. This could include such items as qualifying for additional matching funds, avoiding the loss of matching funds, avoiding program penalties/sanctions or interest charges, avoiding risks to health/security/safety, avoiding the consequences of not complying with State or Federal laws, providing enhanced services, avoiding the consequences of not complying with enterprise technology standards, etc.

Response:

Not Applicable

5. Benefits Not Readily Quantifiable - List and summarize the overall non-quantifiable benefits (i.e., IT innovation, unique system application, utilization of new technology, hidden taxes, improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, meeting a strategic goal, etc.).

Response:

These benefits are listed and summarized in Section I

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)

- The financial analysis contains several questionable entries and provides minimal financial benefit to citizens (0-5 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with few questionable entries and provides a moderate financial benefit to citizens (6-10 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with no problem areas and provides maximum financial benefit to citizens (11-15).



Appendix A. Auditable Outcome Measures

For each of the following categories, list the auditable metrics for success after implementation and identify how they will be measured.

1. Improved customer service **Not quantifiable**

This project improves the access of our citizen to local government annual reports and budgets. It also improves the process for county auditors to submit their required annual reports and budgets by making this an online process.

2. Citizen impact Not quantifiable

The benefits of this project to providing more timely and complete local government annual reports and budgets are significant but not readily measurable.

3. Cost Savings Not quantifiable

The cost saving are expected to be in the improved customer service and citizen accessibility improvements.

4. Project reengineering Not quantifiable

This project will provide a fully web based system for the submission, amendments and publication of the required report submitted by the counties annually.

5. Source of funds (Budget %) Not quantifiable

Development and implementation funding will be 100% from IOWAccess. Post implementation maintenance funding will be 100% from DOM.

6. Tangible/Intangible benefits Not quantifiable

The tangible and intangible benefits are not easily measured.

Order Form

Vendor Information

Cybercon, Inc
 210 North Tucker, Suite 700
 Saint Louis, Missouri 63101
 United States
 Phone: 1 (314) 621-9991
 Fax: 1 (314) 241-1777
 Email: sales@cybercon.com
 Website: www.cybercon.com

Quote Information

Quote Date: 5/30/2008 9:30:31 AM
 Quote ID: 17141
 Contact: Marie Harms
 Email:
 Sales Rep: Jason A. King

Customer Information

CustomerID: iowalibrary
 Iowa State Library
 IOWA,
 Phone: 515-281-3464
 Fax:

ID	Service Name	NRC	NRC Disc	MRC	Qty	MRC Disc	Billing Cycle	Subtotal
18221	Live Helper Pro Plus Package All of the features of our Basic Package Preset HTML Chat Transcripts Basic Stats Preset Text Messages Real Time Spell Check Transfer Push Pages Visitor Profile and Info Customizable Chat Interface (Skins) Pull and Live Interaction Survey SSL Secure Chat	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$39.99	1	15.00%	Annually	\$407.90
Contract Term: Annually		Total NRC: \$0.00		Total MRC: \$407.90		Total: \$407.90		

* NRC = Non-Recurring Charge, MRC = Monthly Recurring Charge

* This Order Form, together with the Master Service Agreement for Cybercon services (<http://www.cybercon.com/ma.html>), constitute your agreement with Cybercon as to the terms of the Service. By signing or sealing the corporate seal below you acknowledge that you have received and reviewed the Master Service Agreement and agree to be bound by its terms.

* Total First Payment Due to Begin Service must be paid before services can be started. We accept Visa, MasterCard, Discover Card, Dinners Club, Checks, Money Orders, PayPal, Wire Transfers and Cash.

Payment Information			
Pay by: <input type="radio"/> Credit Card <input type="radio"/> Check <input type="radio"/> Money Order <input type="radio"/> Paypal <input type="radio"/> Wire Transfer <input type="radio"/> Cash			
Credit Card user, please fill out the following info (required)			
Credit Card No.:		Exp Date (month/year)	
Billing Address:			
First Name:		Last Name:	

CardHolder's Signature:		Card Bank's Tel No.:	
Order Form Approval			
Name(Print):			
Title:			
Signature:			
Date:			

IOWAccess Council
Execution Phase Funding Request
July 9, 2008

Amount Requested: \$245,000.00 – Phase 1

Project Name: ICAB online - 10222
Project Sponsor: Richard Moore – Iowa Child Advocacy Board
Project Manager: Darrell Fremont – DAS-ITE

Project Summary

The ultimate result of this project is expected to be improved safety and permanency outcomes for abused and neglected children being served by Iowa's child welfare system. Project-specific expected result is the development and implementation of Iowa Child Advocacy Online.

Operational improvement results are expected to include:

- a general public accessible website that promotes public awareness of child advocacy issues and includes a volunteer recruitment application and training functions
- a secure website accessible to ICAB staff, volunteers, DHS, Court and other officials designed to facilitate a variety of information exchanges to reduce reliance on paper-based information exchanges and retention practices
- the establishment of a centralized ICAB program operations data system that allows real time updating and accessing by all local offices
- business logic to control the security, storage, backup, and flow of data between office staff, volunteers and the general public
- ICAB capacity to facilitate and participate in future service oriented architecture initiatives and other multi-agency efforts to enhance the coordination and usefulness of data systems with connections to Iowa's child welfare system.

To properly estimate project implementation funding, the project funding requests will be presented in two phases. Phase One activities are listed in this request. Phase Two will include the coding of needed Reports and coding of a web service application for integration of the ICAB document management system (Laserfiche). This was decided due to the volume and complexity of the reports and document management system integration. Additional design and requirements definition are needed in these areas to properly estimate the amount of funds needed. Phasing implementation in this way and will not impact or hinder completion of Phase One efforts.

Implementation Phase One Activities and Deliverables include:

Set up production web server: \$1600.00 direct cost by ITE web hosting services
Purchase license of Windows Server 2003 Standard Edition
VMWare Server Setup

IIS Setup and Configuration

Application programming: 710 hours

Modify adjust and code 51 views

Code 95commands

Data Migration: 600 hours

Create and test data migration scripts

Migrate/verify data of 14 offices: worst case estimate of 40 hours per office

Reports requirements/design: 200 hours

Update and create requirements and design documents for 60 identified reports

Laserfiche web service application requirements/design: 80 hours

Create requirements and detail design documents for web service application

Application testing and customer acceptance: 200 hours

IOWAccess Council
First Year Hosting Funding Request
July 9, 2008

Amount Requested: \$3500.00

Project Name: ICAB Online - 10222
Project Sponsor: Richard Moore – Iowa Child Advocacy Board
Project Manager: Darrell Fremont – DAS-ITE

Project Summary

The ultimate result of this project is expected to be improved safety and permanency outcomes for abused and neglected children being served by Iowa's child welfare system. Project-specific expected result is the development and implementation of Iowa Child Advocacy Online.

Operational improvement results are expected to include:

- a general public accessible website that promotes public awareness of child advocacy issues and includes a volunteer recruitment application and training functions
- a secure website accessible to ICAB staff, volunteers, DHS, Court and other officials designed to facilitate a variety of information exchanges to reduce reliance on paper-based information exchanges and retention practices
- the establishment of a centralized ICAB program operations data system that allows real time updating and accessing by all local offices
- business logic to control the security, storage, backup, and flow of data between office staff, volunteers and the general public
- ICAB capacity to facilitate and participate in future service oriented architecture initiatives and other multi-agency efforts to enhance the coordination and usefulness of data systems with connections to Iowa's child welfare system.

First Year Hosting Activities and Deliverables include:

- Register URL <http://childadvocacy.iowa.gov>
- Transfer completed public facing website content to Production web server environment
- Install Content Management System for ICAB staff use for updating content

Tab B Return on Investment Program Funding Application for FY 09**Contact Information:**

Date: July 9, 2008
 Agency Name: Iowa Child Advocacy Board/DIA
 Project Name: Modernizing Child Advocacy
 Agency Manager: Richard Moore
 Agency Manager Phone Number / E-Mail: Ext. 2-6392 / rmoore@dia.state.ia.us
 Executive Sponsor (Agency Director or Designee): Richard Moore

Amount of Funding Requested: \$ 245,000.00 Phase 1

Section I: Project Description: Describe the project and how the project will to be accomplished. Explain technology that will be used and how this works within your agency's technology architecture and adheres to enterprise wide standards. Describe the investments to be made in infrastructure and services. Explain how the project will fit into your agency and state strategic plan, IT strategic and tactical plan, Governor's leadership agenda, and if appropriate, how the project relates to enterprise wide or multiple agencies' initiatives (*Please limit explanation to 500 words- You may supplement with any tables or data that will assist in understanding project*)

Objective 1: Provide potential and active ICAB volunteers and ICAB staff with web-based information and resources that increase their awareness of child advocacy issues and that facilitate their advocacy work activities and interactions with each other. **Objective 2:** Provide for electronic sending and receiving of reports and other information, much of which are now being copied, packaged and sent through ground-based mail services to and from the state office, satellite offices and program volunteers; and extend e-access to ICAB case-level reports and other documents to DHS, Judicial Branch and others (that currently receive such through ground-based mail) according to their capacities and business rules. **Objective 3:** Make more efficient use of ICAB state office IT staff now having to travel to satellite offices to collect data files and trouble-shoot workstation and database-related issues that could be accomplished remotely with an improved IT environment. **Objective 4:** Establish an ICAB IT environment that allows for participation in future service oriented architecture initiatives and other multi-agency efforts to enhance the coordination and usefulness of data systems with connections to Iowa's child welfare system.

To prepare this proposal, an in-house assessment was conducted of ICAB's IT security, equipment and services; program operations and needs; currently occurring information exchanges with other agencies; and, state and federal requirements for ICAB's development and use of program-related databases.

Consideration also was given to other state offices' IT and program planning initiatives to identify opportunities for improvements to procedures through which ICAB now submits and receives data and reports to and from them.

Judicial Branch IT and Court Improvement Project staff and DHS personnel would be consulted throughout the project to determine how their current and planned efforts could be assisted with new types of information from the enhanced capacities of ICAB's CASA program and Foster Care Registry databases. During the implementation of this project, longer-range multi-agency child welfare-related data coordination plans also would be developed.

Section II: Expected Results

Describe the benefits to be achieved including impact on citizens, other agencies and department staffs. Include estimates where possible of the number of users and how these users will participate in project development and benefit from its availability.

More effective targeting of ICAB resources to direct customer services is expected through reduced paperwork-handling duties of direct service staff. In SFY2006, over 3,700 children were served by ICAB programs that involve 20 local program coordinators and over 900 certified volunteers.

Longer-range expected benefits include improved child welfare system planning and monitoring through the availability of better information from ICAB programs and from multi-agency data coordination activities. It is hoped that increased efficiencies or improved case processing by the Courts and DHS will be possible through ICAB efforts to partner with them on child welfare data coordination efforts. Annually, many thousands of children and families experience the child welfare system and DHS, alone, annually invests over \$800,000,000 in services to children and families in Iowa.

ICAB program coordinators, volunteers and other interested parties will be consulted throughout the project to help make the ICAB IT enhancements responsive to their immediate and anticipated data and multi-agency data coordination needs.

Describe how project assists agency in meeting any mandates, compliance with technology standards or health, safety or security requirements

This project will result in a more secure ICAB IT environment to ensure compliance with state and federal confidentiality policies related to the child welfare and child abuse information collected and maintained by ICAB.

I.C. Section 237.17 requires ICAB to establish a registry of the placements of all children receiving foster care. Included in this law are requirements for DHS to provide ICAB with notices, case plans and case plan revisions regarding all such

child placements. Current levels of compliance with this law are unsatisfactory. The current ICAB IT environment is not resourced to take advantage of current and emerging technology that could be used to solve this problem and, in turn, improve ICAB's ability to comply with I.C. Section 237.18 requirements for the preparation of various reports, evaluations and recommendations. Implementing this project will establish an ICAB IT environment that is capable of new data coordination initiatives with DHS and the Courts designed to achieve compliance with these state laws.

Describe how processes within your agency will be affected by the completion of the project. What changes will occur in organization structure, systems, or processes.

Annually, over 5,000 written, multi-page reports are prepared, copied and mailed by ICAB to Court and DHS officials. A much larger number of documents are mailed from ICAB to volunteers to support their case-level work. Beginning during the implementation year of this project, these ground-mailings will begin being transitioned to electronic mailings. Succeeding years will continue this transitioning of how ICAB sends information internally and to others. The ICAB administrator will work with DHS and others to request and facilitate plans for their electronic submission of data to ICAB. As such plans are developed, originating data sources and database management procedures will be examined to identify opportunities for service oriented architecture-based data exchanges.

This project would reduce the need for ICAB staff to travel to satellite offices to collect data files and trouble-shoot workstation and database-related issues. Time saved would be redirected to quality assurance activities, development of IT-related staff training resources, database management and data coordination assignments. Any satellite office staff time saved will be redirected to direct service improvement activities.

(Please limit explanation to 500 words. You may supplement with any tables or data that will assist in understanding the benefits)

Section III: Financial Analysis

1. Complete table one as outlined in enclosure one to indicate the estimated costs for acquisition/development and ongoing costs for up to five years where applicable. Indicate approximate share of project that will be funded from various funding sources table two to enclosure one.

Although not indicated in the attached "Table One," ICAB staff time will be invested in the implementation of this project. Time of the ICAB administrator and one IT position will be redirected to manage and carryout the activities described above. During the design phase of this project, cost-benefit decisions will be made to determine the use of optional combinations of in-house DIA and ICAB staff and services and/or SLA's with DAS/ITE and/or contract vendors to carry out various

initial and ongoing aspects of this project and its resulting IT environment. Such decisions will impact on the scope and nature of the ICAB staff time investment.

There will be recurring/ongoing monthly costs in '09 through '12 associated with the increased number and capacity of DSL lines and software licensing. It is projected that such costs will be offset through reduced state office travel and overtime costs and through reductions in copying and postage expenses of ICAB reports and other information as transitions from ground-mail to electronic distribution are completed.

2. Estimated cost reductions to agency from project. Quantify actual state government direct and indirect costs (personnel, support, equipment, etc.) associated with the activity, system or process after project implementation. Describe all cost reductions and how those reductions will be achieved including personnel reductions or deferred hiring, table three of enclosure one.

It is estimated that reduction of expenses in certain ICAB general fund budget categories (travel, overtime salary and postage) will occur following the implementation of the improved ICAB IT environment (2009-2012: \$28,000/yr. estimate). Further, it is assumed that, beginning in 2010, the enhanced IT environment and the resulting reduced paper-handling will facilitate additional cost reductions through not filling one support staff position and reconfiguring the assignments and job classes of several other positions following projected staff attrition (2010-2012: \$45,000/yr. estimate). The cost reductions made possible through the proposed IT initiative will allow for enhancements to ICAB core services.

3. Other Benefits. Explain other cost reductions or intangible benefits to customers as defined in section II, these expenses may be of a personal or business nature. Discuss Risks of not proceeding with project including loss of other funds, avoidance of penalties or consequences of not complying with enterprise technology standards.

One of the returns on the investment for this project is the ability of the enhanced ICAB IT environment to streamline office procedures related to the copying and packaging of hard copy reports and documents. Reducing staff time spent on such activities will allow staff to spend more time on case-level work; volunteer recruitment, training and oversight; and preparations of reports to the Court, DHS and other officials. The thousands of children affected by ICAB services will benefit.

This project would establish a more robust ICAB IT environment so it can provide more helpful information about its own programs and Iowa's foster care population to DHS, the Courts, the Governor, the General Assembly and others; and so it can help facilitate and participate in multi-agency efforts to enhance the coordination and usefulness of data systems with connections to Iowa's child welfare system. Another, perhaps farther-reaching return from the requested investment will be the

July 2, 2008

Page 5 of 7

improvements and better-informed case-level and system-wide decisions that can be made with an increase in the availability and usefulness of information about the processes and outcomes of Iowa's child welfare system – a system that involves hundreds of federal, state and local officials; thousands of children and families; and, hundreds of millions of dollars each year.

(Please limit explanation to 500 words. You may supplement with any tables or data that will assist in understanding the benefits of project)

4. Calculate estimated Return On Investment (ROI), table four enclosure one: (displayed below & submitted as separate Excel spreadsheet)

Enclosure One, Financial Analysis Spreadsheet to Return on Investment (ROI)
Program Funding Application

Agency Name: ICAB

Application Name: Modernizing Child Welfare

Table One: Estimated Project Cost

	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12
Development and Implementation Costs	\$140,480	\$245,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recurring Costs		\$3,500	\$3,500	\$3,500	\$3,500
Total Costs	\$140,480	\$248,500	\$3,500	\$3,500	\$3,500

Table Two: Percentage of Costs From

General Fund			100%	100%	100%
Federal or other funding (IOWAccess Council)	100%	100%			
Pooled Technology Fund					

Table Three: Projected Reduction in Expense

For Requesting Agency	\$0	\$28,000	\$73,000	\$73,000	\$73,000
For Other State Agencies	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL Cost Reductions	\$0	\$28,000	\$73,000	\$73,000	\$73,000

Table Four: Calculated Estimated Return on Investment

Total projected cost from table one	\$140,480	\$245,000	\$3,500	\$3,500	\$3,500
Total projected cost reductions from table three	\$0	\$28,000	\$73,000	\$73,000	\$73,000
Projected Net Benefit to the State of Iowa	\$0	\$0	\$69,500	\$69,500	\$69,500

Section IV: Auditable Outcome Measures

For each of the following categories, list the auditable metrics for success after implementation and identify how they will be measured.

- 1. Improved customer service:** satisfaction/usefulness of enhanced ICAB IT capacity as measured through surveys and interviews with volunteers, local office staff and other officials involved with Iowa's child welfare system
- 2. Citizen impact:** % child welfare cases receiving ICAB reviews and CASA services as measured through reports from DHS and ICAB data systems; % ICAB case recommendations accepted through DHS/Court case planning decisions as measured with reports generated from enhanced ICAB databases; % increase in volunteer applications processed

- 3. Cost Savings:** ICAB budget tracked by budget category to determine ongoing impact of enhanced IT environment on various ICAB business processes and operational expenses
- 4. Project reengineering:** specific project milestones (e.g. RFA's issued, bids accepted, equipment installed and databases migrated as scheduled, % reports available electronically, etc.) to be established and tracked upon project funding approval
- 5. Source of funds (Budget %):** N/A
- 6. Tangible/Intangible benefits:** % multi-agency child welfare system data coordination initiatives implemented as planned as measured by ICAB documentation; impact measures of multi-agency child welfare system data coordination initiatives to be determined as initiatives are planned and agreed to by involved parties

Enclosure One – Financial Analysis

Enclosure One, Financial Analysis Spreadsheet to Return on Investment (ROI)
Program Funding Application

Agency Name: DIA/CAB

Application Name: Child Welfare Data Coordination Capacity Building

Table One: Estimated Project Cost*

	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12
Development and Implementation Costs*	\$140,480	\$245,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recurring Costs	\$0	\$3,500	\$3,500	\$3,500	\$3,500
Total Costs	\$140,480	\$248,500	\$3,500	\$3,500	\$3,500

Table Two: Percentage of Costs From

General Fund			100%	100%	100%
Federal or other funding					
Pooled Technology Fund	100%	100%			

Table Three: Projected Reduction in Expense

For Requesting Agency	\$0	\$28,000	\$73,000	\$73,000	\$73,000
For Other State Agencies	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL Cost Reductions	\$0	\$28,000	\$73,000	\$73,000	\$73,000

Table Four: Calculated Estimated Return on Investment

Total projected cost from table one*	\$140,480	\$248,500	\$3,500	\$3,500	\$3,500
Total projected cost reductions from table three	\$0	\$28,000	\$73,000	\$73,000	\$73,000
Projected Net Benefit to the State of Iowa*	-\$140,480	-\$220,500	\$69,500	\$69,500	\$69,500

* This proposal assumes approval of a separate budget request to expand the CASA program from thirteen to seventeen satellite offices to achieve statewide coverage.



IOWAccess Project Concept Paper

1. Email completed copy to the IOWAccess Manager: malcolm.huston@iowa.gov .
 2. Send signed hard copy to Malcolm Huston, IOWAccess Manager, DAS-ITE, Hoover B Level, Des Moines, IA, 50319-0150.
 3. Contact ITE or vendor to prepare for project.
-

Date:

June 9, 2008

Project Name: **DNR Special Events Coordination**

Is this project in support of a program designated as an Iowa Great Place, pursuant to section 303.3c?:

Requesting Agency:

Yes No

Project Point(s)-of-Contact: *(include name and phone number)*

Jeff Kopaska, Natural Resource Biologist (515) 432-2823 X109

Project Sponsor:

Ken Herring, Division Administrator, Conservation and Recreation Division, Department of Natural Resources, 515-281-5529

Background:

The Iowa Department of Natural Resources is the government agency that leads Iowans in caring for their natural resources. It is responsible for maintaining state parks and forests, protecting the environment, and managing energy, fish, wildlife, and land and water resources in Iowa.

The DNR's mission is to conserve and enhance our natural resources in cooperation with individuals and organizations to improve the quality of life for Iowans and ensure a legacy for future generations.

In support of that mission the DNR offers state properties and other state-managed areas for use in terms of "special events". These special events include over 500 fishing tournaments, 300 to 500 ATV, Snow, and Boating activities, multiple Dog Field Trials, Scouting events, fireworks displays, car shows, motorcycle poker runs, pancake feeds, equestrian events and trials, endurance challenges and marathons, "Geocaches" (electronic scavenger hunts using GPS devices), and many more activities.

The current process for booking these events requires promoters, organizers, and the public to plan for their event and to contact the DNR for applications and permits to hold the events a minimum of 30 calendar days before the event. Currently each Conservation and Recreation bureau in the DNR has its own permits and paper forms that must be completed to hold an event on state property. The public may have to make multiple inquiries to obtain the proper paperwork to apply for the permit to hold the event. Often multiple permits must be submitted, as is the case for certain fishing tournaments, where the Fisheries Bureau and Parks Bureau may have to give approval for the event.

Once the appropriate forms are submitted to the department there is much coordination required to ensure that the events are approved, denied or modified by the park or area supervisor, land manager, internal staff supervisors, etc. This process is complicated for a number of reasons including the manual processes and the need to consider safety, crowd control and environmental issues, especially when multiple events may be occurring at the same time on state land.

Coordination of these efforts is imperative so that the events do not interfere with or impede the normal use of the area by the public or cause and extra or unusual hazards to spectators. The DNR is responsible for addressing any objections to events that may be received from other interested parties.

The sponsoring organization needs to indicate whether their patrolling is adequate for safe conduct of the event and in some cases, additional law enforcement assistance is required. The number of vessels or vehicles provided by sponsoring organizations for safety assistance must be known and planned.

Other types of event applications submitted to the DNR capture information about the specific location of the event (lake or specified boat ramp, shelter, picnic area, beach, marina, parking lot, trails, portions of the wildlife area, etc.). The number of participants, the number of spectators and vendor information is also collected. Fishing permits enable the collection of key information necessary to monitor and control biological species of fish. This includes the number of fish caught, whether or not the fish are released, the fish weights and lengths, and the number of people entered for the tournament. Special conditions are also noted by the Fisheries Biologists for internal use by the DNR and, if requested, the applicant must return a report within 30 days after the tournament to the DNR.

Often proof of liability insurance naming the applicant and the DNR as additional insured is necessary. Event coordination is necessary to limit the DNR's responsibility for injury to persons or damage to property arising out of or incident to the activities that are subject to the application. Issuance of a special event permit does not imply that the permittee has exclusive use of the area unless a facility has been reserved pursuant to DNR rule, so it is important that the application understand exactly what privileges for which they are permitted.

Finally, the DNR sometimes attaches separate written information once the permit has been authorized, such as after hour access to the park. Therefore, the information must be processed timely and responses from the DNR may contain separate attachments or documentation with specific stipulations for usage. For example, applicants must have permits available during the event so they can provide it to any State Park Personnel or Conservation (law enforcement) Officer upon request.

The various Special Event Applications and Permits are covered under different sections of Code, depending on the type of event. Timing and coordination are very important when more than one permit is required and must be approved by more than one DNR Bureau. Delays or inability to plan appropriately due to manual processes negatively impact the public in multiple ways (safety, congestion, limits on regular usage, etc.).

Expected Results in this Project:

The expected results of this project include a unified Special Events web application system for the Conservation and Recreation Division of the DNR. The objective is to coordinate various types of events into one streamlined application, approval and notification process, whereby DNR staff has immediate access to information about what events have been scheduled, the type of event and any special information regarding multiple events. This online data will facilitate faster decision making by DNR staff, especially those out in the actual parks (field) based on accurate data that is updated in real time. The current system does not allow access to information and is a manual, time intensive process. The expected result is that the streamlining of workflow processes will occur, enabling appropriate levels of approval by DNR central office and/or field staff in an automated fashion. In some cases multiple levels of approval across Bureaus will be necessary and this system will have the capability to automatically notify and prompt for the necessary approvals, without manual intervention.

The vision is that the public will access the DNR web site to find information about events on State property for any date, whether they want to plan an event, avoid an event, or just use existing facilities. The application will include instructions for all permits and various information regarding requirements for multiple permits. The application will also include other necessary information for the public and organizers.

DNR wants to allow submission of the applications for special event permits online. The application will be automatically routed to the correct approvers. The system will “know” who needs to be informed of the application based on geographic reference information. For example the approval may go to a specific conservation officer based on the county, or a park ranger and/or park manager if it is in a state park. In addition, authorized users, such as park managers, will have the option to select specific days that certain special events will not be allowed at a location, in order to ensure the public has regular access and usage of facilities at the location.

Sometimes the public is unaware that the Coast Guard, Corp of Engineers, or other Federal Government entity is in charge of property and bodies of water in and along the State of Iowa when they are planning an event. The vision is that the new application will advise them of this and of the need for both a State permit and/or Coast Guard, Fish and Wildlife Service, or Corp of Engineers authorization. In addition, the plan is to provide a link from this system to the Federal entity as an additional service to the customer. An exchange of information and data could be possible by linking various systems. For example, automatic links from the new system with the existing DNR Campground Reservation system and other existing DNR systems will be programmed, so that information may be relayed and coordinated between interfacing systems.

Applicants will be required to enter contact information that will be used to provide feedback on their application i.e. they cannot apply for a special event on a particular date. The contact information will also be valuable in case there is a park closing, flooding of trail, etc. that will affect the event and for which the event coordinator will need to be informed.

There will be a web interface where interested parties can query the back-end database to determine when and where special events are scheduled. This query ability will include date queries, location queries, and event-type queries. Query information will help the public to be better informed regarding activities that they chose to participate in or those that they choose to avoid at a state managed facility. In addition, prior to completing the application, the sponsoring organization and the public will be able to view the events already planned and approved for a particular state property online through this system so they have an opportunity to select an alternative site. Information will be stored and displayed on the web site as it is approved, which is a benefit to the DNR and in particular the public that either will be planning the special events or trying to avoid them. Access to data will save effort on the part of the public and DNR and will cut down on inquiries. It will be especially important to the public as information can be accessed on demand at any time and will not require direct contact with the DNR during regular working hours.

Eliminating many of the manual processes will result in streamlined processes within the DNR for DNR Accounting, Customer Service and the Division of Conservation and Recreation staff, while providing the best customer service possible utilizing updated technology.

The new system must be up and running by July 1, 2009. It must include a mechanism for online payments to handle new application fees associated with fishing tournaments. Compliance with the with PCI (Payment Card Industry) standards, the Treasurer's requirements for depositing money and our Accounting staff expectations shall be assured. The coding of the web application should provide the ability to reuse code and charge for other types of fees in the future.

As we transition to a new system, we will also want to ask the applicants if tournaments are “open” or “closed/club only/Invitation only” tournaments, which is an enhancement to the existing processes. Administrative rules will be changed in parallel with system development to streamline processes and requirements.

To summarize, this service to the public will be greatly enhanced and improved through this new web application, enabling 24 x 7 access to information and the ability to interact and submit applications and information and to receive feedback regarding their requests through special editing. Scheduling and approval obstacles will be removed for them. Finally, the overall experience with interacting with the DNR and enjoying Iowa's great natural resources will be superior as a result of implementing this new application.

Request: (include dollar amount and description of what will be purchased - i.e. services, hardware, software)

Business Analyst services will be purchased to do the scope analysis and requirements. In addition, this person will complete screen mock ups, use cases and provide an estimate of the resources needed to complete the design and implementation. Essentially the Business Analyst will complete all aspects of the scope analysis phase as defined by IOWAccess.

Project Timeline:

<i>Phase</i>	<i>Start Month/Year</i>	<i>End Month/Year</i>	<i>Estimated Amount</i>
Scope Analysis	July 2008	August 2008	\$20,000
Design	October 2008	January 2009	Depends on Scope Analysis
Implementation	January 2009	July 2009	Depends on Scope Analysis and Design

Resources Being Contributed: (people or funds being contributed to the project by the sponsoring agency- include role/% of time or amount in dollars)

The DNR will contribute staff time to work with the Business Analyst. It will also provide a work space and resources necessary for the Business Analyst to perform his/her duties of the job.

Recipients of this Service:

The general public and recreational user, businesses, organizations, contestants, exhibitors, United States Coast Guard, Federal Government, DNR field and central office staff (including land managers, parks managers, biologists, law enforcement, policy staff, etc.), politicians, etc.

Acknowledgement of Conditions for

Approval of IOWAccess Project

Project Approval Conditions

IOWAccess Revolving Fund project approvals are based upon the application materials submitted to the IOWAccess Advisory Council and approved by the Director of DAS. Recipients of IOWAccess projects are subject to the following conditions.

- The Iowa Accountable Government Act, Iowa Code Chapter 8E
- Information technology standards and practices that that are applicable to "participating agencies", the Office of the Governor, and elective constitutional or statutory officers pursuant to Iowa Code Section 8A.206.

- Iowa Administrative Code Section 11-25(8A) - Information Technology Operational Standards.
- Policies and procedures of the IOWAccess Advisory Council and DAS as outlined in this acknowledgement or published on their websites.

IOWAccess Project Policy Guides

The acceptance of an IOWAccess Project is based on the following:

- Sponsoring agency is responsible for the efficient and effective administration of IOWAccess Projects through the application of sound management practices.
- The IOWAccess Project Process is guidance only and describes a customary sequence used in software development. As such, sponsoring agencies are not required to conform to the IOWAccess Project Process.
- Sponsoring agency assumes responsibility for using IOWAccess funds in a manner consistent with program objectives and the terms and conditions of the IOWAccess Project.
- Sponsoring agency will commit appropriate resources in a timely manner to the project to prevent undue delay in project completion.
- Sponsoring agency will be responsible for compliance with audit requirements.
- Approval of one phase of an IOWAccess project does not mean that other phases will be approved. Each phase is subject to separate approval.

Guidelines for Costs

Allowable costs

To be allowable under IOWAccess Projects, costs must meet the following general criteria:

- Be necessary and reasonable for proper and efficient performance of IOWAccess Projects.
- Be authorized or not prohibited under State or local laws or regulations.
 - ✓ Not be included as a cost or used to meet cost sharing or matching requirements of any other State or Federal Project in either the current or a prior period, except as specifically provided by State law or regulation.

Reasonable costs

A cost is reasonable if, in its nature and amount, it does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the cost. In determining the reasonableness of a cost, consideration shall be given to:

- Whether the cost is of a type generally recognized as ordinary and necessary for the operation of the sponsoring agency or performance under the IOWAccess Project.
- Market prices for comparable goods or services.

Composition of Cost

Typical costs chargeable to IOWAccess Projects are:

- Cost of materials acquired, consumed, or expended specifically for the purpose of those Projects.
- Equipment and other capital expenditures detailed in the application and previously approved as part of the Project.

Amounts not recoverable as costs under one State or Federal Project may not be shifted to another State or Federal Project, unless specifically authorized by State or Federal legislation or regulation.

Availability of Funds

DAS Finance processes the disbursement of all funds for IOWAccess Projects. Qualifying expenditures for goods and services obtained from other than DAS-ITE or Iowa Interactive, LLC, must be paid by the sponsor and submitted to DAS for reimbursement. In order to facilitate the timely processing of IOWAccess Project reimbursements, entities must use the following process:

- The request must be submitted by the sponsor in writing or through e-mail to the IOWAccess Manager.
- The request must include the following information:
 - ✓ Identification of the IOWAccess Project for which reimbursement is being sought,
 - ✓ The amount of reimbursement requested,
 - ✓ Period of time covered by request,
 - ✓ A comprehensive description of the items covered by the request, and
 - ✓ Copies of any supportive documentation (e.g. vendor invoices, documentation for completed work).
- The IOWAccess Manager will review the supporting financial information and evaluate it against the originally approved project.
- When satisfied that the request meets the stated requirements, the IOWAccess Manager will recommend the request for approval for payment and submit it to DAS Finance for processing.
- In no case will the total reimbursement for each phase exceed the approved amount of the Project phase.

The sponsor seeking reimbursement of expenses is responsible for retaining all necessary documentation pertaining to the relevance and results of the work performed and will provide such documentation upon request. DAS Finance will refer the Auditor of State to the sponsor should there be any questions about the expenditures associated with the Project.

Sponsor Monthly Status Reports

No later than the 21st day of each month the sponsoring agency shall submit a status report to the IOWAccess Manager if work is being performed by a developer *other than DAS-ITE or Iowa Interactive, LLC*. This status report should include:

- A short narrative of the accomplishments for the month.
- Descriptions of any changes in tasks, resources, or issues materially affecting the project plan and, if necessary, a schedule with new target dates provided.

Changes to an Project

All changes to the Project, or the proposal that resulted in the Project, must be reviewed by the IOWAccess Advisory Council. The Sponsor must be prepared to appear before the IOWAccess Advisory Council to answer questions and provide any clarifications necessary prior to any action by the Council regarding a change to the Project. Reasons for requesting a change to the amount of the Project include, but are not limited to:

- Changes in the scope or objectives of the Project.
- Changes in the amount of project funding.
- Carryover of approved funding for a period of more than one year from the date of approval of the original funding.

All changes to an Project recommended by the IOWAccess Advisory Council must be subsequently approved by the Director of DAS.

Project Disputes

Iowa Code 679A.19 DISPUTES BETWEEN GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES.

“Any litigation between administrative departments, commissions or boards of the state government is prohibited. All disputes between said governmental agencies shall be submitted to a board of arbitration of three members to be composed of two members to be appointed by the departments involved in the dispute and a third member to be appointed by the governor. The decision of the board shall be final.”

Sponsor Acceptance

Signing below will signify that sponsor acknowledges and agrees to the IOWAccess project approval conditions as defined in this document.

Sponsor Signature

IOWAccess Manager Signature

Date

Date



DNR Special Events Coordination Project

Prepared by Amelia Adkins

The DNR Boat Docks Project would be a good “base” for this project. There are similarities between the proposed DNR Special Events project and the DNR Boat Docks project. I have listed those below:

- Public access to apply for Licensing/Permits.
- Administrative process that routes the applications to the appropriate DNR staff members for approval or denial.
- Ability for the Public to upload documents with their applications.
- DNR Staff Members have real-time notification that an application, modification or payment has been submitted.

Differences worth noting:

- Coordination of exchanging information and data between the Iowa DNR Special Events system and the Federal system to cover the areas needing Coast Guard, Fish and Wildlife Service and Corp of Engineers authorization.
- Database querying/searching capabilities are considerably larger.

Justification

Project Name: CREW – Iowa Counties Real Estate Web Portal – Execution, approved by the Council on 3/7/2007 for \$146,000 **CR #:** 10200

Project Sponsor: Kenneth Kline

Change requested by: Deb McDaniel

Originator: Deb McDaniel

Urgency: Immediate **Date requested:** June 25, 2008

Additional funds are needed due to the following reasons:

- Description of Change Requested:**
1. Additional coding and testing required to accommodate the changes due to a 5th affiliate coming into the project.
 2. Additional coding and testing required to accommodate the inclusion of an additional IT resource company (ABC Virtual) being added to the project.
 3. Additional meetings and correspondence required to accommodate the addition of a 5th affiliate and an additional IT resource.

Since the inception of the project, numerous changes have taken place on the project which have required additional hours to be spent on the project which were not known when the project was started. Those changes include:

- Reason for Change:**
- 1) An additional Affiliate was added, for a total of five Affiliates. This occurred when the Treasurer Affiliate was divided into the ISCTA Treasurer Affiliate with 88 treasurers and the ITAT Treasurer Affiliate with 11 treasurers. (Although there is difference in the number of counties in each, the number of real estate parcels administered by each is roughly equal.) An additional Affiliate IT resource (ABC Virtual) was also added to the project for the ISCTA Treasurer Affiliate. The impact to the project was the additional testing and meetings necessary to work with the new Treasurer Affiliate on a policy level and the new Treasurer Affiliate IT resource on an IT level.
 - 2) During the initial implementation of the project representatives of The Schneider Corporation proposed to build and administer the CREW portal, in place of completion by DAS-ITE. Schneider, a private company that provides computer services to a number of Iowa counties, was seeking a statewide business opportunity. Schneider claimed a statewide savings of \$500,000 in “public funds” using their approach, and complicated the process when they contacted state legislators before the CREW Board had thoroughly investigated and discussed the proposal. The Schneider proposal also generated a variety of

responses from Affiliate Representatives and competing businesses.

The impact to the project was a month-and-a-half delay in implementation as well as the additional costs of time spent on meetings, phone calls and emails to discuss the proposal by Schneider and how it met the objectives of the CREW portal, compared to completion by DAS-ITE.

- 3) Since the Implementation phase of the project was started in March of 2007, many hours have been spent identifying and resolving the differences in data definitions and formats, not only between the five Affiliates, but also between members of some affiliates and even between the different offices within a particular county.

One example of this is the parcel number, which is generally the unique identifier among all Affiliate members except the county recorders. Although project members were aware that parcel numbers in different counties vary in length between five and twelve digits, what wasn't known was that some counties not only display such parcel number delimiters but store them as part of the parcel number. This includes dashes, periods, and spaces. While it is a simple process from an IT perspective to strip out such delimiters, it is not so simple from the policy perspective. This is due somewhat because each IT resource must receive authorization from its members for such a change. Largely, however, it reflects complexity in working with the diverse authorities of the Affiliates, and their respective members and IT resources.

Although this particular problem has been resolved, the impact to the project has been the delays and additional costs in identifying and working through the issues.

- 4) Changes in Affiliate Representatives within the past fifteen months have necessitated numerous additional meetings, phone calls and emails to revisit previously covered topics to bring new Affiliate Representatives up-to-date and to cover new Affiliate issues.
- 5) Additional hours have been spent in order to work through the policy issues inherent in a volunteer project involving four offices across 99 counties without a centralized authority.
- 6) Additional hours have been spent to pioneer interoperability between disparate and independent systems with diverse data definitions and formats.
- 7) Additional hours have been spent by DAS-ITE to make it easier for the Affiliates and IT resources to identify any issues with the CREW website.
- 8) Additional hours required to review, assign out, work with, and follow up on all issues assigned to each of the Affiliate IT resources.

- 9) Hours were spent setting up a CREW prototype on the web so Affiliates and IT resources could view the CREW site at times convenient to the Affiliates or IT resources.

Due to the above issues additional costs have been incurred. Please see attached documentation for further clarification.

Proposed Approach to Resolve:

Amend the timeline to allow for the existing outstanding tasks to be completed, allow for additional meetings and correspondence to bring new Affiliates up to date on issues and allow for additional time to be spent testing with the new Affiliate.

Impact

- Impact on Scope:** Additional tasks will be added increasing the project scope and cost as well as extending the time frame of the project.
- Impact on Scope Risk:** The additional affiliate increases risk that more issues may arise/occur and requires the need for additional testing to take place.
- Impact on Schedule:** Schedule is increased as additional testing, meetings and correspondence will be required.
- Impact on Staffing Effort:** Additional time is required for staff to work through issues and test with the new affiliate. Additional time will also be spent implementing and testing new code that is required as a result of issues with the new affiliate.
- Impact on Spending:** Additional funds of \$69,120 are requested.

Other:

Billed to: (Accounting Code)

Approval

Project Leader/Date	Customer/Date	Sponsor/Date

Additional Justification.

Additional Coding Required for Fifth Affiliate Being Added to the Project

At the beginning of this project, only 4 (four) affiliates were included. However, an additional affiliate was added for a total of 5 (five) affiliates. This occurred when the Treasurer Affiliate was divided into the ISCTA Treasurer Affiliate with 88 treasurers and the ITAT Treasurer Affiliate with 11 treasurers.

The impact to the project was the additional testing and meetings necessary to work with the new Treasurer Affiliate on a policy level.

Total time needed: 185 hours (design, coding, testing, working with Affiliate, and working with Affiliate IT resources)

Total funds needed: \$22,200.00

Additional Charges for Tasks Performed by Other Areas

When we started the implementation phase of this project, additional tasks by other areas (Security Audits, charges for code pushes, etc) were not included in the project. However, now other areas charge the project and we need to cover those tasks within the project.

Estimated time needed: 57.5 hours

Estimated funds needed: \$6,900.00

Additional testing time –

Total time needed: hour (integration testing, functional testing, performance and scalability testing)

Estimated time needed: 173.50 hours

Estimated funds needed: \$20,820.00

Additional meetings/correspondence for ITE resources –

Estimated time needed: 80 hours

Estimated funds needed: \$9,600.00

Additional project management time

Estimated time needed: 80 hours

Estimated funds needed: \$9,600.00

Total funds needed: \$69,120

IOWAccess Advisory Council DRAFT Dormancy Provision

Proposed: Projects that have not submitted any request for reimbursement within the previous 12 months as of a current IOWAccess Advisory Council meeting may be considered for account closure and subsequent reversion of any balance to the IOWAccess Revolving Fund, provided the project sponsor and project contact have been advised of the closure consideration prior to the meeting.